ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL HISTORY

HAYES AND MOON

113

113

Book No.

This book is the property of the State of Texas

School. Co.

Issued to:		CONDITION OF BOOK	
		Issued	Returned
Ryse Brown,	193		
,	193		
,	193		
,	193		
,	193		

ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL HISTORY

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO · DALLAS
ATLANTA · SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED
LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
OF CANADA, LIMITED
TORONTO

Ancient and Medieval History — The Age of Farmers

From the Beginnings of Civilization, as pointed out on page 21, down to our own Modern Industrial Age, farming has been the main occupation of the vast mass of human beings throughout the world. The "Age of Farmers" really lasts during the seven thousand years which are passed in review from Chapter II to Chapter XXIV of this book.

The frontispiece, suggesting this long "Age of Farmers," is reproduced from a picture in a fifteenth-century French translation of a book on agriculture by a medieval Italian author, a book based on much earlier writings by ancient Romans, Greeks, and Egyptians. It shows farm-laborers digging ditches, planting trees, ploughing and harrowing the soil, sowing seed, weeding a garden (this task is performed by the woman on her knees at the left of the picture), trimming hedges, cutting grain with a sickle, binding the sheaves, and (in the barn) winnowing grain with a flail.



Ancient and Medieval History

BY

CARLTON J. H. HAYES

PROFESSOR OF HISTORY IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

AND

PARKER THOMAS MOON

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

New York

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1930

Copyright, 1929.
By THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

All rights reserved—no part of this book may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher.

Set up and electrotyped. Published May, 1929.
Reprinted July, 1929.
Reprinted September, 1929.
Reprinted May, 1930.
Reprinted October, 1930

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

△

PREFACE

This volume has been written as a textbook for high-school courses in ancient and medieval, or in ancient, medieval, and early modern history. It conforms to the specifications set forth for such courses in the more progressive and up-to-date syllabi of state and local educational authorities in the United States; and it incorporates the suggestions which the authors have welcomed from a number of high-school teachers.

While the text itself has been brought within a compass that can be covered comfortably in a one-year course, the volume is very generously provided with illustrations, colored plates, maps, time-charts, questions for review, topical references for further study, and select bibliographies. The utmost effort has been made to render the narrative especially clear and simple, readable by young people, and, above all, teachable.

The authors have sought, moreover, to present the picture of bygone ages as accurately and as critically as possible, in the light of the researches of scholarly specialists. In the hope that teachers will appreciate a serious attempt to bring a textbook survey up-to-date from the standpoint of scholarship, the authors have ventured in numerous instances to follow these specialists in revising interpretations or opinions which still enjoy some popular currency although now definitely demolished and discarded by the leading authorities. Upon the scholarly works of Breasted, Osborn, Kroeber, Olmstead, Evans, Glotz, Botsford, Boak, Carter, Bury, Thorndike, Spinden, Gowen, Ferguson, Frank, Westermann, Rostovtzeff, Haskins, and many others, as well as upon the numerous competent monographic chapters in the voluminous Cambridge Histories, the authors have leaned heavily. Their own contribution has been chiefly one of evaluation, simplification, and synthesis.

The synthesis is the main thing. And the authors flatter them-

selves that their more intensive studies in modern history have equipped them to emphasize those factors in the distant past which have been most operative in the recent past and are most significant at the present time — precisely those factors which should constitute the most telling synthesis of human history for the boys and girls of to-day, for the men and women of to-morrow. Cultural factors have been emphasized — what is most significant in the society and the economy, in the art and the religion, as well as in the politics and the wars of Stone Age hunters and farmers, of nomadic tribesmen, of the enduring civilizations of Egypt, Babylonia, and Crete, of the Phœnicians and the Hebrews, of Greece and of Rome, and of medieval Europe.

Nor has the vision been restricted to the one stream of "Western" civilization. The endeavor has been made to bring into the synthesis — into the broader and richer stream of world civilization — the noteworthy contributions of China and Japan, of India and Persia, of Mayas, Aztecs, and Incas. A genuine world history of the past is offered as a preparation for an understanding of the world problems of the present.

Realizing that there is no general agreement as to the scope of the first year's course in world history, the authors have so planned this volume that it will cover the maximum period, from the Old Stone Age to the eve of the French Revolution; but it is also designed, Chapter XXIV being omitted, for courses ending with the sixteenth century. Partly for this purpose of convenience, but primarily for a more fundamental reason, the conventional lines of demarcation between "ancient," "medieval," and "modern" history have been subjected to certain modifications and refinements. It has long been customary to regard as "ancient history" everything prior to the German invasions, and to designate the following millennium, from the fifth to the fifteenth century, as "the middle ages," leaving some four centuries to the "modern period." For such a periodizing of history there is some justification; but against it there are also grave objections. The Roman Empire, which is supposed to be "ancient," actually continued in eastern Europe until the end of the so-called "middle ages," while Christianity, the core of "medieval" civilization,

had its beginning and transformed the classical Græco-Roman civilization *before* the commencement of the "middle ages."

If it is impossible to draw a sharp line between "ancient" and "medieval" history, it is equally difficult to delimit the boundary between "medieval" and "modern." We who live in America or Europe of the twentieth century A.D. are still "medieval" in a large number of habits of thought and action. We know quotations from the Bible. We are familiar with Christian churches. We observe one day in the week in some special manner. We all recognize that we are different from Moslems and Buddhists. Our speech, our architecture, our institutions of higher learning, many of our social customs, even our parliaments and juries, date from the "middle ages," as our national languages do. Any periodizing of history is open to objection, but it is especially unfortunate, we believe, to attempt a division of human history into three compartments described as "ancient," "medieval," and "modern."

Yet for practical purposes in writing and studying history, it is convenient to emphasize certain major changes in civilization by the device of "period" labels. More significant, and less misleading than the familiar threefold division would be some such series as the following: (1) an Old Stone Age, the longest and least-known of eras; (2) an Age of Farmers, marked by the transition to civilized agricultural states and by the gradual substitution of copper and then bronze for stone implements; (3) an Age of Oriental Empires, in which the first great civilizations flourished, while copper and bronze gave way to iron; (4) a Classical Age, in which the Greek city-states, then the Hellenistic monarchies, and finally the Roman Republic and Empire blended the heritage of Near Eastern culture and produced masterpieces still styled "classics" by the western world, while in India and China there developed different but comparable "classical" civilizations; (5) a Roman-Christian Period, during which Christianity as the state religion of the Roman Empire modified and extended the classical Mediterranean culture; (6) a Dark Age, which witnessed the partition of the Roman Empire, the decline of culture in the West, and the spread of Christian civilization throughout northern and

eastern Europe; (7) a Middle Age, in which western and central Europe, emerging from barbarism, constructed a rich and many-sided "medieval" civilization; (8) an Era of Transition, in which western Europe, coming into contact with Asia and America, and reviving the classical heritage, entered upon an adventurous career of expansion, national monarchy, religious upheaval, and scholarly humanism; and finally (9) a Modern Period distinguished particularly by the rise of machine-industry, capitalism, natural science, democracy, and nationalism, not only in Europe, but spreading from Europe and America to touch every land. In a general way, the first eight of these landmarks will be remarked in the pages that follow; but such chronological divisions have not been misapplied to Asia and America, nor have they been allowed to obstruct a topical interpretation of the material.

In the last analysis, the usefulness of this book will depend upon its appeal to teachers and pupils in our secondary schools. If it does appeal to them, the credit must go less to the authors who conceived it or to the publishers who gave it an attractive form than to the numberless scholars and commentators who have supplied many of its ideas or have criticized its content. To all of these scholars and critics the authors are deeply grateful. In particular they acknowledge with sincere gratitude the candid and helpful criticism of practised teachers, including Miss Ethel Woolf, Head of the Department of History in the Girls' High School, Atlanta; Dr. W. H. J. Kennedy, Dean of Boston Teachers College and formerly of the Public Latin School, Boston; Professor Irving Raymond of Columbia College; Mr. Thomas Peardon of Barnard College; Professor Wallace Caldwell of the University of North Carolina; and that master-teacher and scholar, Dr. Charles Austin Beard.

The authors also express their appreciation of the courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the American Museum of Natural History, the Avery Library, and of numerous individuals who have given aid in selecting, or permission to publish, the illustrations in this volume.

C. J. H. H.
P. T. M.

April 15, 1929.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

Preface v
General Introduction 1

PART I. BEGINNINGS OF CIVILIZATION 3

CHAPTER

I. The Old Stone Age—The Longest Chapter in History . 4
Unrecorded History 4
The Dawn of History 6
The Hunters of Big Game in the Old Stone Age 8
Hunters and Artists 14

II. The First Farmers and Their Inventions 20
The Age of Farmers 20
Great Inventions of the Age of Farmers 24
Summary 31

III. The Earliest Civilizations and Empires in the Near East 35
Ancient Egypt 35
Ancient Mesopotamia 49
Barbarians, Horses, and Empires 60
The Egyptian Empire 62
Ægean Civilization and the Sea-Kings of Crete 73
Syria and the Semites 77
Empires of the Iron Age 83
The Rise of Persia 91

IV. Separated Civilizations in Asia and America 97
The Far Eastern World 97
The Aryans in India 103
Mayas, Aztecs, and Incas 109

PART II. CLASSICAL CIVILIZATION IN THE GREEK CITY-STATES 121

V. The Rise of the Greek City-States 122
What the Greeks Inherited 122
From Homer's Heroes to the Iron Age 126
Commerce, Colonies, and Culture 134
Spartan Militarism 142
The Athenian City-State 147

CHAPTER PAGE

VI. The Persian War and the Triumph of Athens . . . 162
The Oriental Empire of the Persians 162
The Greeks and the Persian Wars 171
Syracuse and Carthage 179
The Rise of an Athenian Empire 181
The Age of Pericles 186

VII. Alexander's Empire and the Expansion of Greek Civilization 205
Political Changes in the Hellenic World of City-States . . 205
Hellenic Culture in the Fourth Century B.C. 212
The Empire of Alexander the Great 222
Hellenistic Civilization 229

PART III. CLASSICAL CIVILIZATION IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE 243

VIII. The Rise of the Roman City-State 244
Italy before the Rise of Rome 244
The City of Rome 248
Patricians and Plebs in the Roman Republic 252
Unification of Italy by Rome 259

IX. Roman Conquests and Imperialism 270
Carthage and the Punic Wars 270
The Roman Conquest of the Hellenistic East 285
The Conquest of Gaul 295

X. Internal Changes in the Roman Republic 303
Economic and Social Changes 303
Demagogues and Dictators 309
The Dictatorship of Julius Cæsar 317
The Imperial Monarchy of Augustus 322

XI. The Roman Empire and Græco-Roman Civilization . . 334
The Successors of Augustus 334
The Rule of Philosophers and Generals 338
The Later Empire 345
The Roman World and Its Frontiers 349
Government and Law 357
Economic Results of Imperialism 362
Græco-Roman Culture 367

PART IV. THE CLASSICAL AGE IN FARTHER ASIA . . 379

XII. Great Empires in China and India 381
Buddhism in India 381
India in Touch with the Far East 384
The Confucian Age in China 389
China in Contact with India and the Near East 395
The Decay of Classical Civilizations 403

PAGE

PART V. THE TRANSITION FROM CLASSICAL TO CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION 410

CHAPTER

XIII. Christianity in the Roman Empire 411
The Mission of Jesus 411
The Preaching of Paul 415
Christianity in Conflict with Paganism 419
The Early Organization of Christianity 425
The Triumph of Christianity in the Roman Empire . . . 429

XIV. The Coming of the Barbarians 440
Invasions of the Roman Empire from the North: the Germans 440
The Establishment of German Kingdoms in the West . . 449
The Pressure on the Empire from the East: Asiatic Nomads, Slavs, and Persians 454
The Conversion of the Germans to Christianity 462
The Rise of Islam and the Arab Conquests 470

XV. The Dark Age 486
Charlemagne and His Empire 486
The Byzantine Empire 495
Extension of Civilization among the Barbarians of Central and Northern Europe 505
The Revolution in the Moslem Empire 515

PART VI. EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION IN THE MIDDLE AGE 523

XVI. Society in the Middle Age 524
Feudalism 524
Agriculture and the Countryside 533
Industry, Trade, and the Towns 540
Some General Remarks on Medieval Society 551

XVII. Government in the Middle Age 557
Some General Remarks on Medieval Government . . . 557
The Church 559
The Empire 571
The City-States 580
The National States 587
England 589
France 596
Other National States 601

XVIII. Culture in the Middle Age 608
Languages and Literatures 608
Education 616
Theology, Philosophy, and Law 622
Science 629
Art 635

PAGE

PART VII. THE TRANSITION FROM MEDIEVAL TO MODERN CIVILIZATION 644

CHAPTER

XIX. The Crusades 645
Islam and the Seljuk Turks 645
Christian Occupation of the Holy Land 649
Revolutions in the Byzantine Empire 654
The Mongols 660
The Ottoman Turks and Their Empire 664
Christian Conquest of Spain and Repulse of the Turks . . 672
Significance of the Crusades 676

XX. Revival of Autocracy 682
General Factors 682
The Weakening of the Church 686
The Hundred Years' War 694
Rise of Autocracy in England and France 702
Rise of Autocracy Elsewhere in Europe 706

XXI. Distant Explorations and Overseas Expansion . . . 715
Why Europe Discovered the World 715
Europe in Contact with the Far East 719
Europe in Contact with America 726
Effects of European Expansion on Other Parts of the World 731
Effects on Europe 745

XXII. The Classical Revival and the Invention of Printing 752
Rediscovery of Classical Civilization 752
The Study of the Classics 754
Art and the Classical Revival 760
Science and the Classical Revival 772
The Invention of Printing 777

XXIII. The Break in the Church 783
Opposition to the Catholic Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries 783
Rise of Protestant Churches 788
Reform of the Catholic Church 798
Inter-Christian Intolerance and War 800
The Three Great Divisions of Christianity 806

XXIV. Autocracy in Action and Decline 811
The English Revolutions of the Seventeenth Century . . 811
The French Monarchy of Louis XIV 821
The Great Powers of the Eighteenth Century 833
Commerce, Colonies, and Wars of the Eighteenth Century . 844

Epilogue. Passing to Modern Civilization 863

Index 869

LIST OF MAPS

PAGE

Europe in the Ice-Age, *in black* 10
The Egyptian Empire, about 1450 B.C., *in color* . . . . . *facing* 35
Sumer, Akkad, and the Babylonian Empire of Sargon I, about 2800 B.C., *in color* . . . . . *facing* 56
Early Cretan and Ægean Civilizations, *in color* . . . . . *facing* 76
Phœnicia and Palestine, about 1000 B.C., *in black* 78
Assyrian and Babylonian Empires, *in color* . . . . . *facing* 87
Asia, *in color* . . . . . *facing* 97
The Ancient Hellenic and Phœnician Worlds, *in color* . *between* 134–135
Ancient Greece, *in color* . . . . . *between* 146–147
The Persian Empire, about 500 B.C., *in black* 170
Piræus and Athens, showing the Long Walls, *in black* 184
The Athenian Empire, about 450 B.C., *in black* 198
The Empire of Alexander the Great, about 325 B.C., *in color* . *facing* 227
Hellenistic Kingdoms, about 300 B.C., *in color* . . . . . *facing* 235
Early Rome, *in black* 261
Italy, about 265 B.C., *in color* . . . . . *facing* 263
Expansion of the Roman Republic, to 44 B.C., *in color* . *between* 269–270
The Roman Empire, *in color* . . . . . *between* 334–335
The Main Roman Roads, *in black* 352
Asia in Classical Times, *in black* 380
The Roman Empire and Neighboring Barbarian Peoples, about 400 A.D., *in color* . . . . . *facing* 440
German Kingdoms in Western Europe, 525 A.D., *in color* . . *facing* 452
The Roman Empire, 600 A.D., *in color* . . . . . *facing* 459
Charlemagne's Empire and Its Partition by the Treaty of Verdun, 843 A.D., *in color* . . . . . *facing* 494
The Carolingian, Byzantine, and Moslem Empires, about 800 A.D., *in color* . . . . . *facing* 515
Europe Early in the Middle Age, 1095 A.D., *in color* . . *between* 556–557
The Holy Roman Empire in the Fourteenth Century, *in color* . *facing* 571
Italy in the Fifteenth Century, *in black* 582
European Trade-Routes in the Middle Age, *in black* . . *between* 586–587
Christendom and Islam, about 1200, *in color* . . . . *between* 644–645
The Mongol Empire, 1300, *in black* 662
Unification of France and of Spain, *in black* 707

PAGE

Europe, 1500, *in color* . . . . . *facing* 712
Voyages of Discovery, *in black* 722
Africa as Mapped by a Portuguese Geographer in 1457, *in black* . . 724
Colonial Empires, about 1700, *in color* . . . . . *between* 748–749
Religious Divisions in Europe, about 1600, *in color* . . *between* 805–806
Europe, 1650, *in color* . . . . . *facing* 811
Growth of France, 1648–1768, *in black* 829
Northern and Eastern Europe in the Time of Peter the Great, *in color* *facing* 838
Growth of Prussia to 1797, *in color* . . . . . *facing* 843
North America, 1750, *in color* . . . . . *facing* 849
Europe, 1775, *in color* . . . . . *facing* 853

COLORED PLATES

Age of Farmers . . . . . *Frontispiece*

FACING PAGE

Cave-Paintings of the Cro-Magnons 15
Interior of the Parthenon 121
Payment of Taxes in a Medieval Town 523
A Medieval City 580
A Page from an Illuminated Manuscript 615
A Japanese Painting of the Seventeenth Century 739
Raphael's Portrait of Pope Leo X 787

TIME CHARTS

PAGE

1. The Period of Unrecorded History 19
2. The Steps by which Man Climbed from Savagery to Civilization . 33
3. The Earliest Civilizations 50–51
4. From 1000 to 500 B.C. 94

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

	PAGE
Remains of the Earliest Men	7
Making a Fist-Hatchet	8
The Mammoth of the Stone Age	9
Making a Better Fist-Hatchet	11
Neanderthal Man	12
Cro-Magnon Man	13
Early Egyptian Flint Knives	16
Sowing Grain in Ancient Egypt	21
Harvesting Grain	22
Neolithic Lake-Dwellings	24
Making Pottery	25
A Very Early Egyptian Jar	26
Weaving on a Hand Loom	27
Egyptian Metal-Workers	28
An Early Egyptian Bronze Dagger	30
Pyramids and the Nile	36
Guests at an Egyptian Banquet	37
Egyptian Hieroglyphs	39
Egyptian Scribes	40
Egyptian Musicians	42
A Corner of the Great Pyramid of King Khufu (or Cheops)	44
An Egyptian Boat	46
Egyptian Ladies of Fashion	47
Barter in Ancient Egypt	48
Cuneiform Tablets	53
Egyptian War Chariot	61
Thutmose III	63
Avenue of Sphinxes at Thebes	64
Judgment of the Dead	66
A Gold Statue of the Great God Amon	68
Queen Hatshepshut	70
The Great Sphinx	72
Vase of the Bronze Age from Cyprus	73
The Snake-Goddess	74
Egyptian Brickmakers and Stone-Cutters	79
The Egyptian Pharaoh Meneptah	80

PAGE
Bronze Statuette of a Hittite Soldier 84
Assyrian Sculpture 86
Relief from Palace of Ashurbanipal at Nineveh 89
Soldiers Attacking a Fortress 90
A Chinese Wine-Holder of Bronze 101
One of the Oldest Great Buildings in America. Mayan Building at Chichen Itza in Yucatan 110
A Mayan Monument 112
An Example of Mayan Sculpture 113
An Aztec Girl Being Taught to Spin 115
Aztec Girl Being Taught to Weave 115
An Aztec Girl Being Punished for Not Spinning Properly 116
Ancient Mexican God of Rain 117
An Inca Ruler 118
Early Greek Art 122
Early Greek Art 123
Chart of the Stars in the Region of the North Pole 125
Ruins of Ancient Mycenæ 127
The Lion Gate at Mycenæ 129
Menelaus and Helen 130
Mycenæan Art 132
Greek Merchant Ships 136
An Ionian Statue of the Sixth Century B.C.. 137
Sappho 138
Theater of Dionysus at Athens 155
Gate of the Market Place in Athens 158
Assyrian Sculpture 163
Persian Sculpture at Persepolis 165
Tomb of Cyrus 167
A Greek Horseman 172
Themistocles 176
Caryatid from Erechtheum 182
Pericles 187
A Greek Athlete 191
The Parthenon 194
Statuary on the Parthenon 195
Statue of Hermes by Praxiteles 212
The "Orders" of Greek Architecture — Doric, Ionic, and Corinthian . 214
Demosthenes 215
Niobe: An Example of Greek Sculpture in the Fourth Century. . . 217
Socrates 219
Plato 220
Aristotle 221
Alexander the Great 224

PAGE
Battle of Issus 225
Another Famous Example of Greek Sculpture, "The Dying Gaul" . 228
The Winged Victory of Samothrace 230
Laocoön 232
A Hellenistic Statue of an Old Market Woman 233
The Venus de Milo 236
An Ancient Egyptian Game 245
A Græco-Etruscan Chariot 246
Græco-Etruscan Art 247
An Etruscan Painting 249
Decoration on an Etruscan Tomb 250
Italian Armor of the Seventh Century, B.C. 251
Ruins of the Forum and the Temple of Jupiter at Pompeii 266
An Italian Greek Vase of the Fourth Century, B.C. 276
A Græco-Roman Bowl 284
A Græco-Roman Painting 290
Sulla 293
Head of a Roman, First Century, B.C. 300
Cicero 305
Some of the Public Buildings in Ancient Rome 308
Marius 311
Pompey 313
Julius Cæsar 317
The Head of an Egyptian Mummy 320
Front View of the Same Egyptian Mummy 321
Mark Antony 323
"Cleopatra's Needle" 325
Octavian (Augustus Cæsar) 326
Sculpture on the Augustan Altar of Peace or Plenty 328
Virgil 330
Gladiators in the Colosseum 336
Exterior of the Colosseum as It Appears Today 339
Trajan 341
Hadrian's Tomb 342
Marcus Aurelius 344
Arch of Constantine at Rome 347
A Roman Merchant Ship 349
Relief from Trajan's Column at Rome 351
Modern Remains of Trajan's Forum 356
Roman Marriage Scene 361
A Relief from the Arch of Marcus Aurelius 364
The Arch of Titus 368
The Pantheon 369
A Roman Map 372

PAGE
Statue of Buddha 382
Indian Buddha Showing Greek Influence 384
Indian Sculpture 386
An Indian Gateway of the Maurya Period 387
Stone-Work in India of the Maurya Period 389
Confucius 391
A Section of the Great Wall of China 394
A Chinese Statue 397
A Chinese Painting 401
Decoration on a Bronze Mirror 402
Christ as the Good Shepherd 413
Saint Paul's Church at Rome 417
Roman Catacombs 422
Interior of the Colosseum 424
The Apostle Peter 426
Mosaic in Saint Paul's Church at Rome 427
Constantine 430
The Old Church of Saint Peter at Rome 433
An Early Church in the Romanesque Style 436
Tomb of Theodoric at Ravenna 448
Justinian and His Court 453
The Benedictine Monastery of Monte Cassino 463
A Benedictine Monk 464
Cathedral of Canterbury 468
Seventh-Century Clergymen 469
Arabs in the Desert 472
A View of Damascus 480
Mosque of Omar at Jerusalem 482
Charlemagne 490
Otto the Great and His Wife 495
Exterior of Saint Sophia at Constantinople 501
Byzantine Sculpture 503
An Early Russian Church 508
The Viking 510
A Viking Ship 511
Norman Knights Engaged in the Conquest of England 512
Mosque of Hassan at Cairo 517
Moslem Decoration 518
Moslem Architecture 520
Medieval Knight in Armor 527
Medieval Knights in Battle Array 531
A Feudal Castle 534
A Villein 536
Peasants at Work 537

PAGE
Games and Sports in the Middle Age 538
A Professional Jester 539
A Medieval City 542
A Shop at Paris in the Thirteenth Century 544
A Goldsmith's Shop in the Middle Age 546
The Town Hall at Louvain (Belgium) 548
A Bishop in His Official Chair 559
Saint Francis and Saint Dominic 560
The Church of the Monastery of Cluny 563
Pope Innocent III Approving the Rule of Saint Francis 566
The Lateran Palace at Rome in the Middle Age 569
Nuremberg, a German City in the Middle Age 573
Henry IV at Canossa 575
A Doge of Venice 583
Senate Room in the Doge's Palace at Venice 584
A Hanseatic Ship 586
The Crossing of William's Expedition from Normandy to England . . 589
King John Signing Magna Carta 592
Interior of Westminister Abbey 595
Palace of the Capetian Kings of France 597
The Louvre in the Time of Philip Augustus 601
Lord and Lady in a Garden 612
A Class in the Law School of the University of Bologna 619
A "Clerk" of the University of Oxford 621
The Crucifixion, by Fra Angelico 623
Thomas Aquinas 627
A Medieval Drug-Store 632
A Surgical Operation 633
The Cathedral and Leaning Tower of Pisa 635
A Romanesque Church 636
A Gothic Church 638
Gothic Statues 639
Medieval Music 641
The Church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem 648
A Crusader 649
A Feudal Castle Erected by Crusaders in the Holy Land 651
Venice 655
Front of Saint Mark's Cathedral at Venice 658
The Mosque of Mohammed II at Constantinople 667
Belgrade in the Sixteenth Century 669
A Janissary in Uniform 671
The Acropolis under Turkish Rule (1687) 677
Machiavelli 685
Early Cannon 685

PAGE
The Palace of the Popes at Avignon 690
Catherine of Siena Pleading with the Pope 692
A Siege of a French Town during the Hundred Years' War 695
King Henry V of England 697
Joan of Arc 699
A Battle of the Hundred Years' War 701
King Henry VII of England 704
King Louis XI of France 705
Charles V 710
Gild-Houses at Antwerp 711
Vasco da Gama 725
Columbus Presenting His Project to Queen Isabella 727
A Native Indian Prince and His Court 732
The Taj Mahal at Agra 734
A Sixteenth-century Chinese Convert to Christianity 737
One of the Great Native Monuments Found by the Spaniards in America 741
A Persian King of the Seventeenth Century 746
Petrarch 755
Erasmus 757
The Basilica of Saint Peter at Rome 764
The Cathedral of Saint Paul at London 765
Mona Lisa, "La Gioconda," by Leonardo da Vinci 767
Interior of the Sistine Chapel 769
An Example of Raphael's Art 771
Descartes 774
King Francis I of France 775
A Scribe Copying Books for a Library 778
An Early Printing-Press 781
Martin Luther 789
King Henry VIII of England 792
A Wealthy Merchant of the Sixteenth Century 795
A Protestant Minister of the Seventeenth Century 796
The Council of Trent in Session 799
King Philip II of Spain 801
A Protestant Church of the Seventeenth Century 808
Cavaliers and Roundheads 814
Oliver Cromwell Conferring with Lawyers 816
Cardinal Richelieu 822
Louis XIV, the "Grand Monarch" 823
Colbert 825
Distribution of Bread to Poor People in Paris, under Louis XIV . . 832
Peter the Great 836
Catherine the Great 840
How Disobedient Prussian Soldiers Were Punished 842

PAGE
William Pitt, Earl of Chatham 850
Robert Clive 851
King George III 856
George Washington 857
Frederick the Great 859

ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL HISTORY

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The Value of History. — What memory is to the individual, history is to the human race. It explains what we are doing, why we are doing it, and how we came to do it. If you ask why the United States has a president, or why Great Britain has a king, you must turn to history for an answer. Why the Chinese have no alphabet, why Cæsar is studied in high school, why Europe is divided into nations, why books are written on paper, history alone can tell. For history, as we define it nowadays, is the story of all that man has done — his achievements and failures, his inventions, manufactures, and arts, his wars, politics, and laws, his religions, philosophies, and sciences, his hopes and his fears.

Not a hundredth nor even a millionth part of the story is known, but even the part that is known would fill the largest library. Accordingly we have to select what seems of greatest interest to us because of the light it throws on questions that concern educated people at the present time. Between the covers of this book we have tried to condense the chief facts that any educated person of the twentieth century should know about the dawn and early stages of man's career, up to the beginning of modern times.

Many of these facts are so frequently alluded to in books, in newspapers, and in conversation that ignorance of them brands one as uneducated. Such names as Cæsar, Charlemagne, Confucius, Buddha, Columbus, Luther, Archimedes, Alexander, Pericles, Barbarossa, Saladin, and Socrates are familiar to all well-educated men and women. But even more important than being

acquainted with such names is the knowledge of the origins of our institutions (that is to say, our form of government, ways of earning a living, social organizations, education, and so forth), the ability to compare them with the institutions of past ages, and the understanding of how mankind managed to triumph over obstacles, to climb step by step up the ladder of achievement.

Continuity of History. — It is a mistake to think that we may draw any hard and fast line at a given date, such as 1000 A.D. or 1800 A.D., and say that we care little or nothing about what happened before. To explain why America has a jury system, one has to go back to the history of England in the Middle Age; to explain why Latin and Greek are studied to-day, one has to go back not merely to the Middle Age but to ancient Greece and Rome; to explain why our calendar is divided into twelve months, or the circle into 360 degrees, or why the pyramids exist in Egypt, or why our letters are called the alphabet, or why the caste system prevails in India, or why dishes are made of clay, we must go back still farther into history.

Just as what happens to a man in his childhood often explains many things in his later life, so what happened in the childhood of mankind throws light on the present day. One might well say that we are the heirs of all the ages: our inheritance consists of inventions, arts, beliefs, institutions, and ideas that have come down to us, in some cases, from the dim and distant dawn of history. Each generation adds its contribution of good or evil to this legacy. To use another illustration, human progress is like a great river in which the waters that have come down from distant mountain springs are mingled with the flood which each new tributary pours into the ever-growing stream.

PART I

BEGINNINGS OF CIVILIZATION

Introduction

In the first chapter we shall present the chief facts known about the immense expanse of time — the Stone Age — during which mankind made the first great steps in human progress. The following chapter will deal with the great inventions which enabled people to live in civilized communities. The third chapter, a long one, will show great empires arising in the Near East, empires based on farming, trade, and war; and in those most ancient empires we shall find very remarkable civilizations taking form, preparing the way for the brilliant culture of later Greeks and Romans. Finally, in the fourth chapter, we shall broaden the horizon to include the other great civilizations which arose in China and India, separated from each other and from the Near East, and interesting not merely for the sake of comparison but also for the sake of the contributions they were to make in later ages when they entered into modern world history.

CHAPTER I

THE OLD STONE AGE — THE LONGEST CHAPTER IN HISTORY

Unrecorded History

Definition. — Progressive historians define history as the whole story of mankind. In this broad sense, history includes all that we know about the things man has done in the past.

Some historians, however, prefer to limit history to events about which there are records written by man. As the earliest written records go back only to about 3500 or 3600 B.C., this narrow view would confine history to the last fifty or sixty centuries. All that happened before 3600 B.C. would be "*pre*historic." This word is mentioned here because it is so commonly used, but it will not be employed in the following chapters.

Taking the broader view of history as a science that includes all knowledge about man's past, we shall not draw any dividing line between historic and "prehistoric" events. Instead, we prefer to make a division between two kinds of history. One kind is culled from written *records*, and may therefore be called "*recorded history*." The other kind is pieced together from *remains* of what man has made, for example, tools, tombs, temples, houses, paintings, etc. We may call this "*unrecorded history*." For the period before 3600 B.C. we have to depend entirely upon "unrecorded history."

Sources of Unrecorded History. — For the unrecorded history of the earliest ages, we rely chiefly upon three kinds of remains: (1) Thousands of stone tools and weapons have been found, stained and dulled with immense age, and made so beautifully that they can hardly be mistaken for anything else than the work of intelligent human beings. (2) Bones of very ancient men have been

found, oftentimes side by side with bones of animals which no longer exist. Such bones are usually called *fossils*. (3) In certain caves that were inhabited by these early men, paintings, drawings, and carvings afford us further glimpses into the past.

Such remains give us information about some of the things men made and did. We know what kinds of weapons were manufactured, and what animals were hunted. On the other hand, our sources of information leave us with hardly a hint of what men thought or of how they were governed. Unrecorded history can tell us only what the sources reveal; the rest has to be left to the imagination.

The Story Incomplete. — Another reason why the story must be incomplete is the fact that only a small portion of the remains has been discovered. Wooden spears or clubs and garments of fur would rot away without leaving a trace. Even bone vanishes in time, unless it is fossilized in soil rich in lime. Stone tools, fortunately, do not decay; that is why so much of our first chapter is based upon them. But even of the stone tools, probably a majority have never been brought to light. Often they lie buried under many feet of soil. Scientists are still searching for them. In short, we know only a small part of the truth about earliest man; what we do know is the result of quite recent discoveries; and we must keep our minds open to receive light from new discoveries.

Estimating Dates. — It is generally believed by experts that unrecorded history covers an immense span of time, perhaps hundreds of centuries. One recent writer believes man has existed half a million years; another would increase the figure to a million; and still others would make it much smaller. One noted writer cut his estimate in half when he revised his book a few years ago. In our book we shall not ask the reader to accept any such estimates. The important point is to know that while the estimates differ, most of them agree in making the period of unrecorded history enormously long.

Another important point is that all the dates for very early history, all the dates in the first two chapters of this book, are only rough estimates in round numbers. They are based, to be

sure, on careful consideration of the latest scientific calculations; but they are very far from being certain or proved.

An illustration will make this point clear. In the Nile Valley human tools have been found by digging through sixty feet of soil. We know that during the last thirty centuries the Nile has deposited such soil along its bed at an average rate of about four inches a century. At that rate, it must have taken 180 centuries to cover the tools with a layer of soil sixty feet deep, and therefore the tools must be 18,000 years old. But how can we be sure that the rate has always been four inches a century? If the Nile brought down a heavier load of mud and silt in early ages, the estimate of 18,000 years would have to be reduced. Some historians are inclined to reduce it to six or seven thousand; others think it should not be reduced so much. This is not the only method of estimating such dates, but it gives some idea of the uncertainty and of the differences of opinion which prevail.

The Dawn of History

The First Stone Tools. — Pick up, sometime, a rounded stone several inches thick and strike it against another stone until one of them splits apart. Then, choosing one of the pieces, strike it more carefully and see whether you can chip it into such shape that it would make a sharp knife or a good axe-head. That is how our early ancestors made the first stone tools. By experience they found that for this purpose the best kind of stone is flint, because it is very hard and brittle, and can be split easily into sharp-edged pieces.

"Dawn Stones" or Eoliths. — A large number of pieces of chipped flint have been found in Europe which look as if they had been made and used by man. The name "eoliths" (ē′ŏ-lĭths), meaning "Dawn Stones," has been given to these flints. The eoliths are so crudely shaped that one may doubt whether they were wrought by human hands; yet there are several good reasons for believing they were the tools men used in the very earliest ages, in the dawn of human existence.

Beginning of the Old Stone Age. — In course of time the art of flint chipping improved. Men began to make stone tools about

which there can be no
of the *Palæolithic* (pā'l
Stone Age, for "palæo'
Whether it lasted a thou
never know. We can be
in all history, and that

Courtesy of the American Museum of Natural History

REMAINS OF THE EARLIEST MEN

The above bones and tools are remains of some of the earliest beings who were almost certainly *men*, The Neanderthalers.

America would seem like a fleeting moment in comparison with the thousands of years during which men's weapons and tools were made of chipped stone.[1]

[1] A skull found in Java, a jawbone found at Heidelberg, a skull found at Piltdown, and several other fragments are the chief bits of fossil evidence regarding the existence of man in the earliest age. We have considered it wise in this textbook to refrain from indulging in theories regarding this fossil evidence.

ps were only a beginning. one discovered that by chipping flakes very carefully off a round piece of flint, you can leave the core in a pointed shape (as in the illustration). One end is left round, to be grasped in the hand, while the other is fairly sharp. With such a fist-hatchet, if we may call it that, four or five inches long, weighing anywhere from a quarter of a pound to a pound, you could dig for edible roots, chop or split wood, or crush the skull of a deer.

Courtesy of the American Museum of Natural History

AKING A FIST-HATCHET

picture of a modern man holding a fist- the Stone Age and showing how it was y the process of chipping.

Hunting Big Game. — Armed only with such a weapon you might well hesitate to face the ferocious wild beasts that roamed through the primeval wilderness. There was the tough-skinned rhinoceros with a horn three feet long, the great brown bear, the saber-toothed tiger with fangs that were nothing less than tusks, the elephant with ivory tusks longer than a man is tall. Yet the flint-chippers dared to hunt such big game. In the caves and camping places of these early men, we find countless bones of the largest animals, and the bones are cracked, showing probably that the marrow was extracted for food. A little stone fist-hatchet seems so weak as a weapon for hunters of big game, that historians are tempted to wonder whether the rhinoceros and the elephant

were trapped in pits a
elephant hunting would
the hunters needed meat,

Camps and Fire. — As
along river-banks, it is e
camped there in order to h



From W. J. Sollas, "Ancient Hunt

THE MAMMOTH OF THE STONE AGE

A fairly common animal in Europe during the Stone Age. It was about the size of a present-day elephant. Its tusks, large and curved, were sometimes twenty-three feet in length.

catch animals that came to the river for water. In these early hunting camps there may have been campfires, too; at least we know that the big-game hunters sometimes had fires.

Coming of the Ice Age. — Many centuries passed, while the climate grew cold, and colder. European hunters noticed that the rhinoceros, the tiger, the elephant, and the birds of brilliant plumage were migrating southward, toward warm jungle lands.

advance of southward-
customed to cold, were
r, the mammoth with his
y hair, the woolly Siberian
thers. The world, indeed,
any centuries. The glaciers

Courtesy of the American Museum of Natural History

EUROPE IN THE ICE-AGE

The shaded area shows how much of Europe was covered by glaciers.

and snow which ordinarily crown lofty mountains were growing, and extending down into the valleys. The glacial ice-cap of the Arctic was pushing southward, to bury all Scandinavia and northern Europe under a tremendous mass of ice. The same thing was happening in North America. The Ice Age or Glacial Age was beginning. To be more accurate, it was one of several Ice Ages, and probably the last of them.

a
fi
re
at least, t
to scrape hi

The flint im
from the earlier o
flakes, rather than the core, of the flint, and they are chipped only on one side. More important, there was a new method of sharpening tools, when dulled by use. By pressing hard with a pointed bone or horn against the surface of the flint tool, near the edge, a man could detach small flakes or scales with more accuracy than by knocking off chips with another stone. Apparently this new method was extensively used, for tools made in this way have been found in most of the countries that surround the Mediterranean Sea.



Courtesy of the American Museum of Natural History

MAKING A BETTER FIST-HATCHET

This shows how, in the latter part of the Old Stone Age, flint tools were chipped by pressure rather than by blows. The flint blade is a real masterpiece of the Stone Age. No modern man could make it without long practice and great skill.

The Neanderthalers. — One of the cave-men who used such tools has been found, buried in a sleeping position, with his head

g
an
of
possibly or

riod have been
France, a n. They are of a

Courtesy of the American Museum of Natural History

NEANDERTHAL MAN

A photograph of the Neanderthal exhibit in the American Museum of Natural History. It includes some of the bones and tools of the Neanderthalers. The heads in the center show how Neanderthal skulls have been utilized by a modern scientist (Professor J. H. McGregor of Columbia University) as the basis for an attempt to reconstruct the physical appearance of Neanderthal man.

peculiar and unattractive type, with their projecting eyebrow ridges, low foreheads, broad and stooping shoulders and clumsy limbs. Scientists term them the Neanderthal (nā-än′dēr-täl′) race because the first skeletons of this type were found in the Neander Valley (Neanderthal) in Germany.

Rubbish as a Record. — It is surprising that more numerous skeletons have not been found, in view of the fact that generation after generation lived in the same caves. It must have required a very long time to make the thousands of flint tools and accumulate

the thousands of animal bones wh
The tools, and flint chips, and bo
they fell, year after year, and gra
that the wind blew in, or with e
muddy feet of hunters. Occasio
ceiling, too. Thus, very slowly,
tools, bones, rubbish, earth, and r

In one cave, for instance, there is a
Neanderthal rubbish, containing a Neanderth
are twenty-eight inches more of later Palæolithic
fourteen inches of rock from the cave-roof; then another
rubbish; then about four feet of rock and soil that have a
lated in the thousands of years since the cave was last inha
In this cave many Neanderthalers must have lived, to leave ru
bish twenty inches deep, yet only one of them left his skeleton.
What became of the others no man can tell.

Coming of the Cro-Magnons. — One of the great puzzles of history is found in these layers of rubbish. Above the Neanderthal



Courtesy of the American Museum of Natural History

CRO-MAGNON MAN

A photograph of an exhibit of Cro-Magnon skulls and tools in the American Museum of Natural History.

layer one usually finds a layer in which there are skeletons, obviously of later date and of a very different type. They were very tall (the men ranging from 5 feet 10 inches to 6 feet 4 inches), long-legged, well-formed men, these newcomers. They had higher

vs, and rather pronounced chins those of average modern men. he Cro-Magnon [1] (krō′mȧ′nyôn′) s invade and conquer the land, g the stocky Neanderthalers? [2] fought with spear and club, the ending their families, their homes, n the end meeting defeat and death. story, if we could be sure it really happened.

Hunters and Artists

Upper Palæolithic Age. — With the coming of the Cro-gnons in Western Europe, we enter into a new period or sub-ivision of the Stone Age. This period may have lasted from about 15,000 years ago to about 8000 or 7000 years ago. Perhaps its beginning should be put even earlier. Such dates, as we have explained, are only estimates. The chief features of this new period were a change in the making of flint tools, the increased use of bone, a remarkable development of art, clear proof of the use of clothing, and the invention of the bow and arrow.

Bone Becomes Useful. — The Cro-Magnons showed remarkable ability in improving their flint spearheads, knives, and daggers to a point of admirable perfection. But for many tools and weapons they used bone, or ivory from the mammoth's tusks, or pieces of reindeer antlers. For spearing salmon, they fashioned harpoons with barbed tips made of antler. They had javelins, and hammers, and chisels, all of bone or horn, and bone needles, pins, awls, spoons, whistles, and even paint-tubes. So many and so varied were the uses to which bone and ivory and, above all, the antlers of the reindeer were put that one might perhaps call

[1] The first discovery of such skeletons was in the cave of Cro-Magnon, in France.

[2] It is generally assumed that the two races did not mix. Some of the skeletons that have been found, nevertheless, are of such an intermediate type, between the short Neanderthaler and the tall Cro-Magnon, that at least one or two writers have suggested the possibility of intermarriage between the two types.

CAVE-PAINTINGS OF THE CRO-MAGNONS

Pictures of bison as painted by Cro-Magnons in the Cave of Altamira in Spain.



this the Reindeer Age. Scientists call it the Upper Palæolithic Period — that is, the later part of the Old Stone Age.

The Artist in the Cave. — Our picture of the Cro-Magnon life does not have to be wholly imaginative. For the hunters of the reindeer were artists. On antlers and tusks, and on the walls of their caves, they carved amazingly lifelike pictures of the bison, mammoth, reindeer, and horse. On one tusk a charging mammoth is drawn, with lowered head, flapping ears, rolling eyes, lifted tail, and great curving tusks. The hunters learned to make paint, too, and decorated their caves with pictures that are still vivid, as if the painters had lived yesterday.

In the cave of Altamira (ȧl-tȧ-mē′rȧ), in Spain, you can see the shaggy red bison, the horse, and the wild deer, painted in colors on the ceiling. These paintings were first discovered by a little girl, who happened to glance up at the roof of the cavern, while her father was digging for flints and bones. In this same cave there is a charging boar that fairly breathes and a bison beginning to shed his winter coat.

The painters must have practised long, to attain such skill. Can you see one of these men, with his palette and his paint-tubes of hollow reindeer antler, painting on the wall of rock, by the flare of a bonfire, or by the light of a crude lamp? Our painter was rather hairy, if we may trust a few portraits that have been found. He wore clothes of fur or hide, we can guess fairly well, because his people had bone needles, with eyes, and needles mean sewing, and sewing probably means clothes. Moreover, some of the pictures show men and women dressed completely in the skins of wild animals, while other pictures and little statuettes show them without clothes. The women, by the way, braided their long hair.

The First Jewels. — The Cro-Magnons were also fond of decorating themselves. They made necklaces of bone beads, and teeth, and shells. They buried their dead, too, with such necklaces, as well as tools and weapons, and sometimes they painted the bodies. Oddly enough, from our point of view, it was the men, rather than the women, who usually wore the necklaces. They had bracelets, too, and brooches and pendants. All their jewelry was made of ivory, bone, shell, or amber, as no metals were known.

The Bow and Arrows. — In some of the paintings made in the caves thousands of years ago, there are pictures of men with bows and arrows. Here we have proof of one of the greatest early inventions. There is other proof, too, for the arrow-straighteners of these same men have been found. Without the bow, man's weapons carry no farther than he can cast his spear. With it, he can shoot a more distant enemy, hunt large animals more safely, and kill birds and swift, small animals. The bow and arrow must have been regarded as a marvellous and precious invention. It was not only used in the last part of the Old Stone Age, but it long remained as one of the chief weapons of man, in the chase and in war, until finally replaced by modern firearms.

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

EARLY EGYPTIAN FLINT KNIVES

Review. — Although the Old Stone Age was probably the longest period in human history, we know very little about it, because we have to rely entirely upon the "unrecorded history" which can be pieced together from remains of tools, skeletons, cave-paintings, and so on. There are no names of kings or dates of battles to burden the student's memory. We do not even know that there were any kings. How the early men governed themselves, whether they were organized in tribes or clans, what they believed about religion and morals — all such questions are shrouded in mystery.

What we do know is that, during this immense age, men took the first great steps toward control of nature. They learned to

make tools, such as the flint fist-hatchet, and they gradually improved their methods until, in the Reindeer Age, they had a large assortment of different types of stone and bone tools suited to many uses. They invented weapons such as the spear and the bow and arrow, which assured man's supremacy over the beasts of prey and which enabled hunters to obtain their food supply more easily. They learned how to kindle fire, and how to cook their meat. They learned how to clothe themselves in skins and furs, and invented the thread and needle for sewing these clothes. They showed artistic ability in their drawings, engravings, and paintings.

This list of achievements may seem small, when we remember that it was stretched out over thousands of years. As with a child learning to walk, the first steps were the hardest to make. After a genius has invented radio, many men can make improvements. And the genius could not have invented radio if other men before him had not learned a great deal about electricity. Nor could any one make a radio before fire and the smelting of metals were discovered. Every modern invention rests upon a pyramid of earlier inventions. That is one reason why, in the early career of man, progress was almost inconceivably slow.

This early progress was as important as it was slow. Try to imagine what life would be without tools, weapons, fire, clothing, art, and language (language has not been mentioned because we know almost nothing about its origin, except the one fact that it, too, must be traced back to the Stone Age). Try to imagine how you would discover the use of fire or invent tools, if you started without any previous experience or knowledge of such things, and you will begin to realize the value of the achievements of the men who made the first steps in human progress.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. What is meant by "prehistoric"? By "unrecorded history"?
2. What are the sources of our information regarding the Stone Age?
3. Why is it impossible to give a detailed history of the Old Stone Age? About what aspects of the Old Stone Age do we know little or nothing?
4. How long is the Old Stone Age supposed to have lasted?

5. Why do authorities differ regarding the dates of the Old Stone Age?
6. What are eoliths?
7. What effect did the last Glacial Period have on men's ways of life?
8. In what respects did the Cro-Magnons have a higher culture than that of the Neanderthalers?
9. Make out a list of the things that you think a man or woman probably did during an average day in the Old Stone Age, and compare these activities with those of a modern man or woman.
10. Ask your father or mother to mention the most important inventions made during his or her lifetime; then make a list of these and compare it with a list of the inventions of the Old Stone Age. Which list of inventions is more important?

SPECIAL TOPICS

The world in the Old Stone Age. Sollas, *Ancient Hunters*, 133–138; Peake and Fleure, *Hunters and Artists*, 28–39.

Animals hunted by prehistoric men. Osborn, *Men of the Old Stone Age*, 90–95, 101–102, 109–110, 144–148, 202–211.

Old Stone Age tools. Wilder, *Man's Prehistoric Past*, 153–187; Kroeber, *Anthropology*, 155–165; De Morgan, *Prehistoric Man*, 35–79.

Old Stone Age life. Kroeber, *Anthropology*, 165–175; Peake and Fleure, *Hunters and Artists*, 77–95.

Cro-Magnon man. Wilder, *Man's Prehistoric Past*, 416–431; Osborn, *Men of the Old Stone Age*, 260, 272–275, 289–301.

Paintings in the caves. Osborn, *Men of the Old Stone Age*, 315–330, 364–365, 392–427.

How the map of the world changed. Cambridge Ancient History, I, 1–18; Osborn, *Men of the Old Stone Age*, 35, 109, 116, 149, 189.

Fossil man. Wilder, *Man's Prehistoric Past*, 436–455; Kroeber, *Anthropology*, ch. ii; Encyclopædia Britannica, new vols., II, 781–783.

The Neanderthalers. Wilder, *Man's Prehistoric Past*, 387–416; Osborn, *Men of the Old Stone Age*, 211–215, 248–258.

The Ice Age. Osborn, *Men of the Old Stone Age*, 86–90; Sollas, *Ancient Hunters*, 1–17; Elliott, *Prehistoric Man*, I, ch. vii.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THE TEACHER

H. Peake and H. J. Fleure, *Apes and Men;* also *Hunters and Artists*. J. J. M. de Morgan, *Prehistoric Man*. R. A. S. Macalister, *Textbook of European Archæology*. C. E. Vulliamy, *Our Prehistoric Forerunners*. H. F. Osborn, *Men of the Old Stone Age*. W. J. Sollas, *Ancient Hunters*. M. C. Burkitt, *Prehistory*. H. H. Wilder, *Man's Prehistoric Past*. G. G. MacCurdy, *Human Origins*. Cambridge Ancient History, I.

TIME CHART NO. I

THE PERIOD OF UNRECORDED HISTORY

About 5500 years ago

Beginning of recorded history—earliest inscriptions in Egypt and Mesopotamia (about 3300 B.C.)

About 6000 (?) years ago	Numerous tombs and skeletons	NEW STONE AGE (Neolithic culture)	In Europe, ground stone tools, Swiss lake-dwellings	Earliest copper articles in Egypt and Western Asia
About 10,000 (?) years ago	Numerous skeletons		Earliest ground stone tools and pottery in Europe	Pottery in Egypt and Western Asia
About 10,000 (?) to 25,000 (?) years ago, during and after last great Ice Age or Glacial Period in Europe	A few dozens of human skeletons of Cro-Magnon type and others (Aurignacian, Grimaldi, etc.)	OLD STONE AGE (Upper Palæolithic or Aurignacian, Solutrian, and Magdalenian cultures)	Chipped flint tools and weapons; bone tips for harpoons and javelins; bow and arrow; carved ivory; paintings, etc., in European caves.	
Still earlier, before and during last great Ice Age or Glacial Period in Europe	Several complete skeletons and dozens of incomplete skeletons of Neanderthal men in Europe.	OLD STONE AGE (Middle Palæolithic or Mousterian culture)	Chipped flint tools with retouched edges. In Europe, Africa, and Asia	
Still earlier. Dates very uncertain.		OLD STONE AGE (Lower Palæolithic or Pre-Chellean, Chellean, and Acheulian cultures)	Chipped flint fist-hatchets and other flint tools. In Europe, Africa, and Asia	

Below this line are remains about which we are uncertain. They may or may not be human.

Still earlier. Dates very uncertain.	Piltdown fragments of human (?) skull, England Heidelberg jawbone, Germany Java skull (*Pithecanthropus*)	Eoliths (flint chips) found in Europe and Egypt and alleged by some authorities to have been made or used by man, but not universally accepted as proofs of man's existence.

CHAPTER II

THE FIRST FARMERS AND THEIR INVENTIONS

The Age of Farmers

The World 8000 Years Ago. — Eight thousand years ago the inhabitants of Europe were still in the Old Stone Age; they were the hunters and artists described in the last part of Chapter I. In America the ancestors of the modern American Indians were probably in a similar stage of progress; according to one theory, they came from Asia, bringing with them the tools and weapons of the Old Stone Age. In northern Africa, likewise, there lived Old Stone Age hunters. For central and southern Africa and for eastern and southern Asia, we have very little information about this period. Meanwhile, thanks to agriculture and to a series of great inventions, real civilization was arising in the Near East.

The Near East. — We shall refer often to the Near East, because it was the home of the first great civilizations. The semicircle of lands around the eastern Mediterranean — including Egypt, Syria, Mesopotamia, Asia Minor, the Ægean Islands, Crete, and the Greek Peninsula — formed a region particularly favorable to the rise of civilization. These lands we shall group together as the Near East. In Egypt and Mesopotamia were rich river-flats or alluvial lands, whose dark and fertile soil yielded bounteous crops to the earliest great farming nations. In Asia Minor, in Cyprus, and in other parts of the Near East, were abundant veins of copper awaiting the first metal-workers. Rivers afforded easy transportation for men who could launch canoes and small boats; and the eastern Mediterranean, dotted with islands, offered to bolder sailors a splendid highway of adventure and of commerce.

Moreover, in the Near East the three continents of Europe,

Asia, and Africa are joined together, and the people of the Near East learned inventions, and later obtained raw materials, from all three. Egypt, for example, got the horse and the chariot from Asiatic invaders.

The New Stone Age. — The great inventions which we are about to describe lifted man to a much higher level of comfort and made it possible to build up civilization more and more rapidly. They effected such a revolutionary change in the way men lived that we may regard them as marking the end of the Old Stone Age and the beginning of a new era in history. The new period is usually termed the *Neolithic* (nē-ŏ-lĭth′ĭk) or New Stone Age, because the stone tools were now ground on a whetstone instead of being sharpened by chipping. A much better name for the period is the "Age of Farmers," for the beginning of agriculture was far more important than the new method of making tools. The Age of Farmers began in the Near East certainly as many as 7000 years ago, and perhaps still earlier. It has never really come to an end. In this chapter we shall describe only the beginnings of the new age.

The First Farmers. — Doubtless from very early times men ate berries and fruits and possibly some roots and seeds, which

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

SOWING GRAIN IN ANCIENT EGYPT

This picture on the wall of an ancient Egyptian tomb shows how grain was sowed in very early times (about 2700 B.C.). The man at the left carries the seed-grain in a bag, from which he takes a handful at a time to cast on the ground. The plough drawn by cattle is used to cover the seed with earth, and finally the seed is trampled into the soil by a herd of sheep.

they found growing wild. It may have been only by accident that seeds were first dropped near the cave or the house, and sprang up, and thus suggested the idea that by planting seeds nearby one could have a handy supply. Once the idea was

formed, there must have been a certain amount of trial and error, before the best results were obtained. At length, however, we find the people in Egypt and Western Asia, and later in Europe, growing barley, wheat, millet, peas, and lentils. Later they added beans and apples, and still later, other grains, vegetables, and fruits. Agriculture began. Grain was dried and stored, to be eaten in the form of unleavened bread. Some of this bread has been found in the dwellings of early farmers. Bread became the "staff of life," and farming became the basis of men's life in the earliest great civilizations.

Effect of Farming on Population. — The cultivation of wheat and barley made it possible for hunters in some regions to settle

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

(1) (2) (3) (4)

HARVESTING GRAIN

(1) The reaper cuts the grain with a sickle while another man binds it into sheaves. At the extreme left stands the overseer. (2) Next the sheaves are loaded on the backs of donkeys and carried to the threshing-floor. (3) Then donkeys tread out the grain on the threshing-floor and a man with a pitch-fork piles the straw up in a heap. (4) Finally the grain is winnowed, to separate the chaff from the wheat. These pictures are from the walls of an Egyptian tomb built about 2700 B.C.

down and build villages and, later, cities, and develop great civilizations. If there had been no cultivation of grain, men must have remained hunters, few in number and scattered. Millions of farmers can live in a region that would support only a few thousand hunters, because to have plentiful game the hunter must have wide areas for hunting grounds.

Effect on Civilization. — Even more important was the effect of farming on civilization. Now for the first time men could join together in large enough groups to establish kingdoms and empires; for the first time these groups could produce enough wealth to make possible the building of beautiful palaces and temples and to support a leisure class that could devote its efforts to art,

to writing (soon to be invented), and to other aspects of the highe life, instead of hunting merely to supply themselves with meat.

Taming Wild Animals. — Almost as remarkable was the change from hunter to herdsman. For thousands of years in the Old Stone Age men had depended for food on their success as hunters and fishermen. When game was scarce, they went hungry, and sometimes starved. Only when animals have been tamed is the meat supply regular and sure.

The first tame animal, probably, was the dog. It is thought that wild dogs prowled about, picking up scraps of meat and bones that men left after their meals. Gradually, the scavenger must have grown bolder, followed man more closely, and become less wild. In the course of time, the dog became man's companion, his helper in the hunt, his loyal friend.

Perhaps it was this experience with the tame dog that suggested the taming of other animals. Or possibly, when game was scarce, some one hit upon the idea of capturing wild animals and breeding them for meat. At all events, men began to keep cattle, pigs, goats, and sheep. The meat supply was certain, then. Cows also supplied milk. Some of the earliest herdsmen depended more upon milk and cheese than upon meat for food.

Cattle and sheep were probably first domesticated in western or central Asia, according to what evidence we have; but cattle raising, like grain-growing, soon spread far and wide.

Transportation. — The taming of animals provided men not only with food, but with better means of transportation. In the Near East donkeys were used for carrying loads and hauling wagons. Oxen or bullocks were used to drag heavy loads. The invention of the wheel, by the way, was one of the great achievements of this age. Horses, swifter than oxen or donkeys, were first tamed in central or western Asia, probably, and were not used in the Near East until much later, and then chiefly for war chariots and for riding, rather than as beasts of burden. When the camel, "the ship of the desert," was first used we do not know; but its introduction was in very ancient times.

Other Achievements. — While grain-growing and the taming of animals were most important in bringing about the change

from an age of hunters to an age of farmers, there were other great achievements which accompanied this change. The axe and the whetstone, the art of pottery, the spinning of thread and weaving of cloth, and the melting and casting of metals must rank among the foremost inventions of all history. To them we now turn our attention.

Great Inventions of the Age of Farmers

1. The Axe and the Home. — Among the achievements which ushered in the new age, one of the most important may seem simple enough — the invention of the axe. Humble as it may appear, the axe probably changed life greatly, because it enabled

Courtesy of the American Museum of Natural History

Neolithic Lake-Dwellings

The probable appearance of very early dwellings on the shore of Lake Geneva (in Switzerland). Such lake-dwellers lived in the period when Europe was entering upon the New Stone Age. They had already learned the art of cultivating grain; and, as the picture shows, they were able to build houses. The boats and fishing-nets seem to indicate that these lake-dwellers must have depended on fishing, as well as on agriculture and hunting, for their food supplies.

men to cut timber, build log houses, and construct rafts and ships. These things are not easy with a fist-hatchet. The axe brings the cave-man out of his damp, dark cave, to live in villages of wooden houses — that is, where there were forests. (Where timber was lacking, houses were made of mud or of boughs woven together and plastered over with mud.) The first axeheads were heavy pieces of stone, with one sharp, chipped edge. They must have been bound to a stick by means of leather thongs. One day some one learned how to grind the edge by rubbing it on a whetstone. Still later, another inventor bored a hole in the axehead for the insertion of the handle or haft. And so the axe was made.

The Secret of the Grindstone. — The same process of grinding that made the axe cut deep and true was applied, gradually, to stone spearheads, daggers, chisels, and hammers. The method of grinding and polishing was probably first learned in the Reindeer Age, and used in shaping weapons and tools of bone. The use of the grinding method on hard stone, however, was a new departure that must have called for patience as well as ingenuity. It marks a new stage of culture. Indeed, the new age is often called the age of ground stone implements, or, as we have noted, the New Stone (that is, *Neolithic*) Age. But the grinding of stone was only one, and by no means the most noteworthy, of the new achievements.



Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

MAKING POTTERY

At the right the potter shapes a pot with his right hand, while with his left hand he keeps turning it on a wheel (the "potter's wheel"). At the left, another man is baking a pot in the oven, to harden it. Above are a number of completed pots. From an Egyptian tomb (about 2000 B.C.).

2. Pottery. — With agriculture many other inventions went hand in hand. For instance, grain had to be ground, and small

stone mills, turned by hand, were made for this purpose. And grain had to be boiled or baked in some sort of dish or pot. Somehow, somewhere, some one discovered that wet clay can be molded at will into pots, and jars, and dishes; and that when these are baked, they become hard. That is how all crockery, earthenware, and dishes are made.

Pottery and History. — The art of making pottery or crockery seems a homely theme for history, but it has some interesting features. For example, when bits of pottery are found in the remains of a very early dwelling, it is almost a certainty that the potters had advanced from the level of hunters to the higher level of agriculturists. Pottery seems to have accompanied agriculture, perhaps because pots and jars were so useful for storing and drying grain or for boiling cereals. Furthermore, since the pattern and decoration of jars and pots depended on fashion and custom, various styles of pottery developed in different localities, and these styles provide the historian with an invaluable clue to events such as migrations of peoples and growth of trade.

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

A Very Early Egyptian Jar

It shows boats, human figures, and ostriches.

Pottery and Art. — Above all, pottery became one of the chief means by which artistic impulses were given an imperishable expression. Something of the soul of the early pot-makers still lingers in the baked clay. At first pots were useful, but not

beautiful. Then the custom arose of rubbing the surface of pots with some substance such as graphite, which would give them a glossy, black polish. Somewhere, in Egypt or in Asia Minor, a new kind of coloring was discovered. A certain kind of clay containing iron oxide turns a rich brick-red color when baked. So redware spread over the Near East.

For further decoration, the potter pressed or scratched designs into the soft clay before baking, and sometimes filled the incisions with gypsum, which remained clear white. That gave a rather striking effect, but still men were not satisfied. The early designs were patterns of straight lines, curves and spirals, zigzags and dots. Gradually, however, potters began to paint on the finer vases and jars real pictures of men, and boats, and beasts, and battles, pictures that in course of time became indescribably beautiful.[1]



Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

WEAVING ON A HAND LOOM

Picture from an Egyptian tomb (about 2000 B.C.). Weaving was done by hand. First the "warp threads" were attached to the "warp beam," which was part of the wooden framework known as a "loom." Then the "woof" thread, wound on a shuttle, was woven back and forth between the warp threads and pressed into place with the "beater in."

3. **Linen.** — Cloth, too, was probably invented in the same region and at about the same period as pottery, agriculture, and animal husbandry. In Western Asia there grew wild a small plant with a blue flower, a plant whose stem contained long, tough fibers. If the stems are soaked in water and beaten or crushed, the fibers can be separated and twisted into

[1] One of the remarkable inventions that may be noted in passing is the potter's wheel. The earliest pots were shaped by hand, often very gracefully. But with a revolving disk or wheel on which the clay vessel was turned, it was easier to make the shape of a pot or vase more nearly circular.

thread, and woven into cloth. That is the secret that some one discovered, thousands of years ago, when the first linen cloth was made from the fibers of the flax plant. Linen seems to be the oldest kind of cloth. And the oldest scrap of linen — how old we do not know — was found in a very ancient Egyptian grave. We know it was used for clothing, because there are ancient Egyptian pictures of men in cloth garments. We know, too, how the flax was spun into thread. A length of loosely twisted fibers was fastened to a small weight, a piece of clay, which was spun around, thus twisting the fibers tightly. Flax was also used for cord and rope, for fishnets, for sails.

4. The Conquest of Metals. — The crowning achievement of the Neolithic Age was also its death-knell. It was the conquest of

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

EGYPTIAN METAL-WORKERS

The fire is fanned by bellows worked with the feet (upper left corner). The metal is melted in a crucible, held over the fire between two rods (lower left), and is then poured into molds (center). At the right, metal vases are being beaten into shape on an anvil, polished with small pebbles, and decorated with engraving.

metals which brought the Stone Age to an end. It may be that one night some Neolithic hunter, who happened to make his camp fire among stones containing copper, found in the morning bright beads of shining metal which had melted out of the ore. This story, however, of the discovery of the first metal, is no more than guesswork. We do not know even the place or date, much less the details, of the invention.

The First Copper. — What we do know is that a few copper ornaments were possessed by the Egyptians about six thousand years ago, and also at about the same period by the Sumerians in Babylonia, by the inhabitants of Turkestan, and by the people of

Syria. Who first used copper is hotly disputed. Some claim the honor for the Egyptians; while others contend that copper was found in one of these other countries and brought into Egypt by invaders. Until the excavation of ancient ruins has shed more light on the question, we may say simply that copper was coming into use in Egypt and Western Asia six thousand years ago.

Centuries rolled by before the full significance of the great discovery was realized. For a long time copper was used only for jewelry and art, while men continued to rely on stone for their tools and weapons. In Mesopotamia the Sumerians made heads of copper for their statues of lions. Copper mines were discovered in the Sinai peninsula, in Asia Minor, and in other countries, and as copper became more plentiful it acquired greater importance. Soon the coppersmiths of the Near East were making knives, axes, and other weapons of copper. Other metals, too, were used in jewelry, though rarely. For instance, in one Egyptian tomb about six thousand years old, there was found a necklace of gold beads strung — oddly enough — with iron beads. Silver was also known.

Invention of Bronze. — Copper is too soft to make a good knife or axe. Another invention was needed. If a little tin is fused with copper, the resulting metal is much harder than either tin or copper. This alloy or mixed metal is bronze. Bronze will take a good edge, for a knife or a spear or an axe. The Egyptians learned the secret of bronze about a thousand years after they knew copper. But the absence of tin ore in Egypt is a reason for suspecting that the fusing of tin with copper originated somewhere else, perhaps in Asia Minor. Bronze was soon being used in many countries for swords, daggers, arrowheads, axes, awls, gouges, and hammers.

The Sword. — The swords were particularly interesting. In the Stone Age there had been no swords (unless of wood or bone, and none such have been found), but there had been daggers of chipped and ground stone. With copper, and later bronze, the shape of the old stone dagger was at first copied, but little by little the dagger was lengthened and broadened until it became a half-sword, and finally evolved into a short sword. It continued to grow in length, especially after the invention of iron, until the

barbarians of northern Europe were making a sword so unwieldy that even a strong man had to use two hands to swing it.

Copper and Commerce. — One very important result of the introduction of copper and bronze was the growth of mining, prospecting, and commerce. Copper mines were worked in Sinai and in Asia Minor, as we have said, at a very early date. Eager prospectors must have searched far and wide for other supplies. Mines were developed in Cyprus and Crete, in Spain, in Italy, in Great Britain, and other countries. Copper and bronze articles were carried from Spain up into western Europe, from Italy into central Europe, from Cyprus to Syria. In short, they were traded from one land to another over surprisingly wide areas.

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

An Early Egyptian Bronze Dagger

Iron. — For a very long time, say twenty centuries, bronze reigned supreme as the metal with which men worked and warred. Why iron was not substituted sooner is a little surprising, for iron ore is much more widely distributed and more plentiful than copper. Iron, however, is not so easy to smelt, and it is very difficult to cast into small molds. It was known in Egypt, probably, for centuries before it was much used. Somewhere between 1500 and 1200 B.C.,[1] however, it was discovered that iron could be beaten into shape while hot and malleable, and hardened or tempered by plunging it, still hot, into water. Tempered iron makes better knives and swords than bronze. Rapidly iron weapons came into use in Asia Minor, Egypt, and Europe. The Hittites in Asia Minor became leaders in the use of iron. The Bible tells

[1] "B.C." means "Before Christ." The year 1500 B.C. was about 3430 years ago.

us that in the time of Saul the Philistines defeated the Hebrews, because the former had more iron. Homer's "Iliad" mentions iron twenty-three times, but bronze more frequently. Iron-using invaders overthrew great kingdoms in Crete and Asia Minor. Even barbarian tribes in northern Europe soon had iron swords.

Summary

Neolithic Culture. — The growing of grain and herding of cattle, and the series of great inventions just described, particularly the axe, the pottery jar, spinning and weaving, and the casting of metals, marked the beginning of a new epoch in man's career. They marked the real beginning of civilization. They made it possible for the hunters of the Old Stone Age to become the civilized farmers of the New Stone Age. The civilization of the New Stone Age has often been called Neolithic culture, for want of a better name; but there is no sharp dividing line between the New Stone or Neolithic Age and the so-called Age of Metals. In fact, men began to use metals during the New Stone Age. Neolithic culture was really the civilization of the first farmers.

These first farmers were also the first men to build houses for themselves instead of living in caves or camping in the open. For the first time, mankind knew what it meant for a family to have its own home.

In this same age the first towns were built. Remains of such towns have been found in Persia, in Mesopotamia, in Egypt, and in Crete. The oldest towns of which we know were built in these countries.

Because the early agricultural or Neolithic civilization appeared in different countries at different times, we must not try to assign definite dates for a "Neolithic period" or "New Stone Age" including all countries at once. It is better to regard the New Stone Age as a stage of civilization which the Near Eastern countries entered more than seven thousand years ago, and which lasted until the use of copper tools became common, about six thousand years ago. Europe lagged behind the Near East, but gradually farming and the great inventions spread through southern and central Europe and then to northern Europe. Eastern

and Southern Asia also seem to have followed the lead of the Near East. America was isolated from the Old World but nevertheless in the tropical parts of America an agricultural civilization developed which will be discussed in a later chapter.

Steps of Human Progress. — The story is summarized in a more graphic way by Chart No. 2, which indicates some of the chief steps by which man climbed from the ignorance of the cave to the power and knowledge of civilized life. The first steps, such as the origin of languages and tools and the use of fire, are obscured in mystery, as we see. Then there are three remarkable series of steps. One thing to notice is the way in which the long stretches of time between steps grow shorter. On the Lower Palæolithic level man may have lived twenty-five, fifty, or a hundred thousand years — at least a long time. On the Upper Palæolithic level he tarried perhaps seven or eight thousand; on the Neolithic, only one or two thousand. Since then, in the past six thousand years, he has climbed so rapidly and eagerly that no chart could show the countless steps he has ascended.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Ask your father or mother to mention the most important inventions made during his or her lifetime; make a list of these and compare it with a list of the achievements of the New Stone Age. Which list is more important?
2. Make out a list of the things that you think a New Stone Age man (or woman) did during his (or her) average day, and compare these activities with those of a modern man (or woman).
3. How was the manufacture of stone tools improved during the New Stone Age?
4. What achievements marked the coming of the New Stone Age?
5. What inventions made it possible for cities and civilized states to develop?
6. What are the sources of our information regarding the New Stone Age?
7. When did the Stone Age end?
8. What is meant by the Bronze Age? The Copper Age? The Iron Age?
9. Why were copper and bronze employed thousands of years before iron came into general use?

TIME CHART NO. 2

THE STEPS BY WHICH MAN CLIMBED FROM SAVAGERY TO CIVILIZATION

NOTE: This chart is intended only to give a rough idea of the first steps toward civilization. In each series of steps the exact order is not known, nor are the dates at all certain. The nature of each step and the uncertainty regarding dates are explained in Chapters I and II. Compare Time Charts 1 and 3.

NOTE: No one knows how long ago these steps were made. If some estimates are even approximately correct, we should have to extend the Lower Palæolithic Level two or three inches to the left, and the earlier steps would have to be moved from 10 feet to 25 feet farther to the left.



10. Mention some of the earliest kinds of domestic animals and explain their uses in the Age of Farmers.

11. Where and when did the agricultural civilization of the New Stone Age first make its appearance?

SPECIAL TOPICS

New Stone Age. WILDER, *Man's Prehistoric Past*, 197–234; CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY, I, 65–71; MACCURDY, *Human Origins*, II, ch. xii.

Dawn of the Bronze Age. WILDER, *Man's Prehistoric Past*, 234–250; CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY, I, 103–106; MACCURDY, *Human Origins*, II, ch. xiii; DE MORGAN, *Prehistoric Man*, 111–126.

Coming of the horse. CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY, I, 106–109; PEAKE and FLEURE, *Peasants and Potters* (use index).

Dawn of the Iron Age. WILDER, *Man's Prehistoric Past*, 250–265; MACCURDY, *Human Origins*, II, ch. xiv; KROEBER, *Anthropology*, 419–425; CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY, I, 109–110.

Cattle. PEAKE and FLEURE, *Peasants and Potters*, 29–43; MACCURDY, *Human Origins*, II, 151–154.

Pottery. PEAKE and FLEURE, *Peasants and Potters*, 44–61; MACCURDY, *Human Origins*, II, 75–91.

The Lake Dwellers. MACCURDY, *Human Origins*, II, 44–47, 67–75; CHILDE, *Dawn of European Civilization*, 244–259.

The "Food Collectors." PEAKE and FLEURE, *Peasants and Potters*, 7–13; CHILDE, *Dawn of European Civilization*, 1–20.

Neolithic implements. DE MORGAN, *Prehistoric Man*, 80–98 (difficult but with useful pictures).

Early agriculture. DE MORGAN, *Prehistoric Man*, 168–173.

Canoes and boats. MACCURDY, *Human Origins*, II, 141–148.

The first houses. DE MORGAN, *Prehistoric Man*, 153–159.

Weaving. MACCURDY, *Human Origins*, II, 91–93 and figs. 294, 295.

Uses of fire. MACCURDY, *Human Origins*, II, 134–138.

Megalithic culture. MACCURDY, *Human Origins*, II, 109–129.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THE TEACHER

H. PEAKE and H. J. FLEURE, *Peasants and Potters;* also *Priests and Kings*. V. G. CHILDE, *Dawn of European Civilization*. J. M. TYLER, *The New Stone Age in Northern Europe*. H. FRANKFORT, *Studies in Early Pottery of the Near East*. Also works cited for Chapter I.



THE EGYPTIAN EMPIRE, ABOUT 1450 B.C.

CHAPTER III

THE EARLIEST CIVILIZATIONS AND EMPIRES IN THE NEAR EAST

The Heart of the Old World. — The earliest civilized kingdoms and empires of which we know grew up in the Near East, in the lands around the eastern Mediterranean, the countries which form the meeting place of three continents, the heart of the Old World. There arose the proud, rich empire of the ancient Egyptian Pharaohs, the opulent Babylonian empire, the warlike Assyrian monarchy, and the island dominion of the sea-kings of Crete.

Flourishing side by side, these ancient Near Eastern civilizations had much in common, and exchanged wares of commerce as well as ideas and inventions. Perhaps if it were possible to combine the histories of all of them in a single narrative, we could see more clearly how they resembled and influenced one another. Unfortunately, such a narrative would be confusing and difficult to read. It is simpler to tell the story of each country separately, but the reader should never forget that the stories really should be placed in parallel columns, as in Time Chart 3 on pages 50 and 51 of this chapter.

Ancient Egypt

River Farms and Barren Plateaus. — When we speak of Egypt, we mean a long green ribbon of fertile fields, only ten miles wide in some places and twenty or thirty in others, shut in by yellow limestone cliffs on each side. Beyond the cliffs there lie the trackless yellow sands of the desert plateau — the Libyan desert to the west, and the Arabian desert to the east.

Ages ago, the plateaus on either side of the valley were probably not desert, but well watered, and hunters of the Old Stone Age scattered their tools of chipped flint there, as well as in the valley

below, which was probably a hunter's paradise of jungle and big game. As hundreds of centuries rolled by, however, rains grew scarce. The plateau, parched and barren, was deserted, and people lived in the valley, along the banks of the River Nile. Often a whole year passes, now, with no rain at all in large parts of Egypt.

The Nile. — In a very real sense, Egypt is the daughter of the Nile. Even the soil of Egypt comes from the great river.

PYRAMIDS AND THE NILE

Thousands of miles to the southward, where the Nile rises among the highlands of east-central Africa, heavy tropical rains feed the streams which pour into the Nile their torrents of muddy water, until the Nile itself rises by as much as twenty-five or thirty feet, overflowing the grainfields. When it subsides, it leaves on the

fields a layer of dark, rich mud or silt. With good reason the ancient Egyptians called their country the "Black Land" (*Kem*).

Remains of Predynastic Civilization. — The annual deposits of new soil have not only made Egypt marvellously fertile, but they have buried many of her ancient monuments and towns. Therefore, much of her history has been discovered by excavations, and some of it, especially in the Delta, has been covered so deep that it has never been brought to light. That is one reason why it is impossible to trace the connection between the Old Stone Age hunters of the plateau, and the comparatively civilized people

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

GUESTS AT AN EGYPTIAN BANQUET

Guests seated in chairs are being served with food and drink and adorned with ornaments. Men and women wear collars and bracelets and have cones of fragrant ointment on their heads. The women have earrings and fillets with lotus flowers drooping over the forehead. From a wall-painting in an Egyptian tomb (about 1500 B.C.).

who left in the valley, at a much later date, their pottery and beautifully chipped tools, their cemeteries, and their skeletons.

These later people had houses of wattle (twigs or reeds woven together), tilled the soil and raised cattle, wove linen cloth and shaped pottery vessels out of clay. They constructed boats, too, and ventured out on the Nile in them, with bows and arrows, to hunt the crocodile and hippopotamus. In the jungles (for the land had not been entirely cleared of trees) they hunted the elephant and the giraffe. Perhaps they had even invented a system of writing.

This civilization is usually termed "predynastic" (prē′dī-năs′tĭk) culture, because it existed in Egypt even before the First Dynasty of Egypt. A dynasty (dī′năs-tĭ) is a series of kings or emperors of the same family; when that royal family dies out, or is overthrown, a new royal family or dynasty obtains power. In all, there were thirty dynasties in Egypt between the years 3500 B.C. and 332 B.C. As the first king of the First Dynasty came into power about the year 3500 B.C. (some say 3400 B.C.), the period before 3500 B.C. is termed *pre*dynastic. When the predynastic agricultural civilization began in Egypt, and whether it was introduced by invaders or originated by the natives, are matters of dispute. We can safely say that the predynastic civilization existed at least a thousand years before 3500 B.C., and several good authorities would date its origin thousands of years earlier.

The Calendar. — It is fairly certain that the calendar was invented in Egypt, in the region of the Nile Delta, somewhere near the year 4241 B.C. Among most primitive peoples, the waxing and waning of the moon afforded the most natural calendar, based on a month of twenty-eight days. But such a calendar does not fit in well with the annual cycle of seasons, from winter to winter, as determined by the position of the sun in the heavens. The Egyptians discovered that the cycle of seasons, or solar year, contains 365 days, and based their calendar on that discovery. They divided the year into twelve months, each of thirty days, and added five holidays at the end, to make up the total of 365.

Egyptian Writing. — The oldest specimens of Egyptian writing are supposed to date from about 3500 B.C., but doubtless the system is older than that. Like many other peoples, the Egyptians at first wrote in pictures. When they wished to mention a bird, they drew or carved a picture of a bird, and if they meant several birds, they put several pictures in a row. To tell the story of a battle, they drew pictures of men fighting. A sketch of rumpled hair indicated grief; a palette and a reed meant writing, or a scribe.

The next step was still more ingenious. It was to represent sounds, rather than objects or ideas. The Egyptian word for

"go out" sounded a good deal like the word for "house," and so they used the sign of a house (a rectangle with a door in one side) when they had to write "go out." This was really punning, as if we should make a picture of an eye to signify the word "I." From

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

EGYPTIAN HIEROGLYPHS

A fragment of papyrus, dating from about 1000 B.C., depicting a priestess after her death making offerings to the god Osiris. The hieroglyphs are at the top and down the left side of the picture.

such punning, it was easy to proceed to the invention of an alphabet. The word for mouth, for example, was *rŏ*, and so the picture of a mouth ( ) could be used for the consonant "r." Similarly other signs were used for other sounds, so that, when they wished,

the Egyptian writers could spell out words for which they had no sign.[1]

The invention of writing was probably the most important event in ancient Egyptian history, if we consider its effect on the higher life of the people. It also had a great effect upon business



Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

EGYPTIAN SCRIBES

At the left, the scribe stands before a writing table on which are two writing tablets and a pot for water; he carries his palette under his arm and a brush over each ear. In the center a scribe is writing. At the right, a scribe stands with his palette in one hand and his manuscript in the other. From Egyptian tomb-pictures (about 2900–2600 B.C.).

life, because it made possible the keeping of records and the making of contracts; and it helped the growth of government, because laws could be put in writing, officials could send reports to the king, and the king could send out written orders to his officials.

[1] Because the Egyptians had sound-signs to represent the consonants but not to represent the vowel sounds in their language, they omitted the vowel sounds. As a result, when we try to put Egyptian words and names into modern English spelling, we do not know what vowels to insert. Thus some writers think the name of a certain Egyptian king should be pronounced as if it were spelled Thothmes, and others think it should be Thutmose. Some think the name of a certain Egyptian god should be spelled Ra, while others prefer Re. In this book we use the spellings preferred by the leading Egyptologists (experts on Egypt); but the student will find other spellings when he consults other books.

Hieroglyphic Inscriptions and Cursive Writing. — When they carved their writing on stone monuments, Egyptians were careful to make each picture-sign clear and accurate. This writing we call hieroglyphic (hī′ẽr-ō-glĭf′ĭk). For ordinary writing, they used ink and wrote on papyrus, a sort of paper made from the stems of the papyrus plant. Indeed, our word *paper* comes from the name of the plant which gave the Egyptians their common writing material. Papyrus was so convenient that the accounts of merchants, the records of officials, personal letters, and royal decrees were written upon it. So much writing there was that in everyday practice people simplified the hieroglyphic pictorial characters to such an extent that the pictures can be recognized only by an expert. This simpler and more rapid form of writing is known as the *cursive* (running hand) or *hieratic* (hī′ẽr-ăt′-ĭk) and corresponds to our handwriting. Much later, a still shorter form of writing, more or less like modern shorthand, was invented; this is called the *demotic* (dē-mŏt′ĭk).[1]

Unification of Egypt. — From the hieroglyphic inscriptions and the monuments that they left, and from more or less legendary narratives that were believed by Egyptians in later ages, we can patch together the story of Egypt's rise and fall. Probably there were a number of independent tribes or city states along the Nile before the dawn of recorded history. They were like beads on a string, the Nile being the string that held them together. In course of time they were merged into two rival kingdoms. The southern

[1] The method of deciphering (reading) Egyptian writing was discovered in the nineteenth century. The names of Cleopatra and Ptolemy were found carved on an ancient Egyptian obelisk in Greek letters and also in Egyptian hieroglyphs. By comparing the letters, it was possible to discover the meaning of the hieroglyphs. Moreover, Napoleon's soldiers had found near the mouth of the Nile a large stone slab on which a certain statement had been inscribed in Egyptian hieroglyphics and also in the Egyptian demotic style, as well as in Greek. This is known as the "Rosetta Stone." Knowing the meaning of the Greek words, and knowing a few of the hieroglyphs, a young Frenchman by the name of Champollion (shäɴ′pōl′yôɴ′) was able, by comparing the Greek and Egyptian letters, to discover the meaning of the Egyptian inscription and the secret of Egyptian writing. This discovery opened up for historians a vast store of material, because a great number of Egyptian inscriptions on stone and of Egyptian writings on papyrus had been preserved and could now be read.

kingdom, called Upper Egypt because it embraced the upper part of the Nile, was ruled by a king who wore a tall white crown, and who was supposedly under the special protection of Horus, the hawk-god. Probably the southern king coveted the wealth of his neighbor, the king of northern or Lower Egypt, whose realm included the rich Delta. At any rate, King Narmer or Menes (mē′nēz) came down from the southern kingdom, conquered the Delta, and added the red crown of Lower Egypt to the white crown of Upper Egypt.

The Old Kingdom and its Pharaohs. — The "Old Kingdom" established by Menes lasted nine centuries, from about 3500 B.C.

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

EGYPTIAN MUSICIANS

The flute, the three-stringed lute, the harp, and the barrel-shaped drum were favorite musical instruments in ancient Egypt. The figure in the center is a blind singer with a small harp.

to about 2630 B.C.[1] Great was the power and the pride of the kings who inherited from Menes the double crown of united Egypt. To kiss the foot of the king was a signal honor; most persons were permitted only to kiss the dust at his feet. In his palace of brick or dried mud, he was surrounded by obsequious courtiers and by a multitude of servants. He had wigmakers, sandal-makers, perfumers, launderers, and even a special official

[1] These are the dates adopted by Hall in the *Cambridge Ancient History*. Certain other authorities think 3400–2400 B.C. more accurate.

in charge of cosmetics. Harpists and flute players made music for his pleasure, and dancing girls beguiled his leisure. Like modern oriental monarchs, he had a number of wives in his harem, but one of them was his favorite and was considered queen. His palace was called *Per-o*, the "Great House," and from *Per-o* is derived the title Pharaoh (fā′rō), which is often applied to the ancient Egyptian kings. Exquisite vases of alabaster and carved rock crystal, chairs with carved ivory legs, ebony chests inlaid with ivory, jewelry of gold and precious stones, and pottery wine jars are among the relics which enable us to visualize the luxury of the royal court.

Tombs and Pyramids. — The most amazing manifestation of royal wealth and power was in the pyramids. These great masses of masonry, at which modern tourists marvel, were really royal tombs. From very early times the Egyptians, as we have seen, took great care to bury their dead in tombs, with supplies of food, drink, face-paint, weapons, and other things that the dead were supposed to need. As time went on, more pains were taken to provide the dead with comforts, and the tombs became more elaborate, for it was believed, apparently, that the *ka* — the immortal part, we may say — of the dead man had need of his body and of bodily nourishment.

Naturally a king desired more luxurious equipment for the future life than other men did. Not only food and drink, but wives and servants were buried with him. We do not know whether the servants and women were slain at his death; perhaps in very early times they were. The royal tomb, too, must excel all others in size and grandeur. Each king endeavored to make sure of this by building his own tomb. Larger and larger the tombs were built, until the climax was reached with the Great Pyramids of the kings of the Fourth Dynasty (3100–2950 B.C.).

Greatest of all was the Great Pyramid of King Khufu (kōō′fōō), who is sometimes called Cheops (kē′ŏps). It covers thirteen acres and its peak towers higher than all but the tallest modern "skyscrapers." A hundred thousand men are said to have been employed twenty years to erect this imposing pile of stone, and we

may well believe that the story is true, for the pyramid is built of 2,300,000 blocks of granite, each block weighing on the average 2½ tons. In the interior were concealed vaults and passages. It seems almost incredible that so difficult a feat of engineering could have been accomplished without iron tools, without steam-power or machinery. But it is even more difficult to realize that

A Corner of the Great Pyramid of King Khufu (or Cheops)

The pyramid is 481 feet high and 755 feet square at the base.

all this stupendous task was performed in the vain hope of providing comfort after death for one man. Nor was the pyramid all. East of it King Khufu built a magnificent temple, in which he expected to have priests perform sacred rites for his benefit forever. The temple, however, has long since disappeared, and the pyramid-tomb has been broken open, though it still

stands as a monument to Khufu's power and a mockery of his hopes.[1]

Government. — At the head of the *central government* was the king or Pharaoh, who made the laws, acted as supreme judge when disputes were appealed to him from the lower courts, commanded the army, controlled the execution or administration of laws, and frequently made tours of inspection to see that all was well in the realm. He also had religious functions, such as performing certain ceremonies, ordering the construction of temples, and making offerings to the gods. Indeed, he was considered to be the son of Re (rā), the sun-god.

The king had a host of officials to aid him in conducting the central government. The highest officials, such as the secretary of the treasury (to use a modern expression), the secretary of agriculture, the chief justice, and the royal architect, were really heads of administrative departments and might be regarded as a sort of cabinet. Under them were a great many lesser officials and scribes or clerks, busily engaged with their reed pens and their sheets or rolls of papyrus, keeping records of tax payments, expenditures, and other details. All these officials had their offices in the many brick buildings which clustered near the royal palace at the capital, Memphis, conveniently situated on the Nile just where Upper and Lower Egypt met. At Memphis there were also huge granaries to store the grain received from the local tax-collectors, for taxes were paid in the form of grain, cattle, and other goods. Coined metal money had not yet been invented.

The *local government* was conducted by officials known as nomarchs (nŏm′ärks), who were appointed by the king and carried out his commands in the forty or more provinces (*nomes*) of Upper and Lower Egypt. These nomarchs or provincial governors collected taxes in grain and cattle, and sent them to Memphis. They also administered local justice, commanded the local militia,

[1] The Great Sphinx which stands near the Great Pyramids has been made the subject of many legends, but was originally intended as a portrait of one of the kings, possibly King Khafre (khăf′rȧ). The body, in the shape of a lion, symbolizes the king's power. Early Egyptian kings wore a lion's tail, doubtless for the same reason.

and had charge over the worship of local gods. In course of time, the noblemen whom the king appointed as governors came to regard their offices as hereditary privileges, which could be handed down from father to son like their personal property and their titles of nobility. More and more they took power into their own hands, disregarding the central government.

The importance of this first great government in history should be clearly understood. It did more than collect taxes and take a census of taxpayers. It maintained law and order throughout the country; it supervised the irrigation system upon which the prosperity of Egypt depended; it kept the irrigation canals in good repair and compelled workingmen to clean the mud out of them, lest they should become clogged; it built great tombs and splendid temples adorned with artistic sculpture and painting — tombs and temples which only a king could afford to construct.

The Nobles. — The noble lived in a palace built of brick and wood, colorfully painted and decorated with rich hangings of

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

An Egyptian Boat

bright-hued tapestry. Around the house were gardens, fig-trees and palms, vineyards and cool arbors in which the noble family spent many a happy hour. On the Nile, nearby, was a sailboat, in which his lordship would often take his family out fishing or duck-hunting. Indoors, the house was sumptuously furnished. Chairs and stools were of ebony, beautifully carved and inlaid with

ivory. Probably the walls and ceilings were painted in tasteful designs, and undoubtedly there were graceful vases and ornaments of copper, stone, and pottery. The lord of the house dressed simply, in a white linen kilt, but he was fond of jewelry and often wore a broad collar or necklace of gold and precious stones. He took pride in being immaculately clean and smooth-shaven. As he

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

EGYPTIAN LADIES OF FASHION

At the left, an Egyptian lady at her bath; one attendant pours water over her, a second rubs her arms, a third holds a flower for her to smell, and a fourth holds a collar. In the center, a lady holding a mirror is rouging herself. At the right, the seated lady, holding a mirror in one hand and a cup in the other, is having her hair arranged.

shaved even his head, he wore a wig on state occasions. His wife, or wives, wore longer wigs and collars and necklaces and bracelets of gems and gold. A lady's dress was a simple, close-fitting garment of fine linen.

The Common People. — About the common people, we know relatively little. The peasants must have lived in mud huts, and tilled the land or tended the herds for their masters. They were not exactly slaves, but might be described as serfs, for they could be sold with the land, like cattle or trees, from one master to another. In the towns there were merchants, jewellers, coppersmiths, pot-makers, professional writers or scribes, and other craftsmen; but we do not hear much of them in this early age.

Fall of the Old Kingdom. — As the power of the nobles waxed great, that of the Pharaohs waned, until at length a few of the nobles dared even to declare themselves independent and fell to quarrelling for supremacy. There is reason to believe that inva-

sions from Asia added to the turmoil. In the midst of civil wars and confusion, the Old Kingdom fell into fragments about 2630 B.C. It had lasted about nine centuries — about six times as long as the United States of America have existed as a nation.

The Middle Kingdom and the Feudal Age. — Although the country was again brought together under one scepter by an energetic Theban prince, and what historians call the Middle Kingdom (about 2400 to 2000 B.C.) was established, the nobles remained so strong that this is often described as the "feudal age." Vigorous and statesmanlike kings labored in vain to lay a firm foundation for their throne. One famous king (Senusret III) extended the frontier of Egypt southward to the Second Cataract

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

BARTER IN ANCIENT EGYPT

In ancient Egypt goods were traded or bartered for other goods, instead of being bought and sold. At the left, a dealer and a woman are haggling over a string of pearls. At the right is a vegetable dealer (kneeling) who is accepting a string of beads in exchange for some vegetables. The man at the extreme right is waiting to trade a fan for vegetables.

of the Nile and had his subjects and slaves hew a canal 260 feet long and 34 feet wide through granite cliffs, so that ships could sail above the First Cataract. Another king (Amenemhet III) built a great dam, twenty-seven miles long, in a valley called the Fayum, for the purpose of creating a reservoir of water for use in irrigation during the dry season. This same king ordered his officials at the Second Cataract to keep a record of the height of the water in the Nile so that crops could be estimated in advance for each season, and taxes apportioned according to the crop. The king also established a colony of miners in the Sinai (sī′nī) Peninsula, east of Egypt, to quarry turquoise and copper.

Fall of the Middle Kingdom. — In endeavoring, however, to remove the feudal nobles from their posts as provincial governors, and to transfer the local government in large share to middle-class officials appointed by himself, the last great king of this period overreached himself. Against him, the discontented nobles dared not rebel, but hardly had he been laid in his tomb, when rebellion and civil war broke out. The Middle Kingdom practically came to an end about 2000 B.C.

Ancient Mesopotamia

How Rivers Made Mesopotamia. — While the wealthy empire of the Pharaohs was arising in Egypt, a rival was growing up in another fertile river valley, six or seven hundred miles to the east. Strictly speaking, Mesopotamia (mĕs′ŏ-pŏ-tā′mĭ-*ȧ*, derived from Greek words meaning "the middle of the rivers" or "between the rivers") is the plain between the Tigris (tī′grĭs) and Euphrates (ū-frā′tēz) rivers. The mud brought down from the northern mountains by the sluggish, chocolate-colored Euphrates, and to a smaller extent by the Tigris, each year adds 72 feet to the alluvial plain, pushing the Persian Gulf farther and farther back. Six thousand years ago, the two rivers did not join as they now do, but flowed into the Persian Gulf separately, and cities (Eridu and Ur) that are now 125 miles inland were then on the shore of the Gulf. Even then, however, the plain that had been formed by the rivers was about two hundred miles long and possibly a hundred or so broad, at the widest part. This plain was the cradle of Babylonian (băb′ĭ-lō′nĭ-*ăn*) civilization.

Why River Flats Made Civilizations. — It is a striking fact that the two countries which gave birth to the most ancient great civilizations were both alluvial lands, that is, lands whose soil was once deposited by rivers. Such soil is usually extremely fertile. In ancient Mesopotamia the river flatlands yielded three heavy crops of wheat a year and immense quantities of dates. Mesopotamia and the Nile Valley were called the "granaries" of the ancient world. Such lands could support a large population and make possible the growth of powerful and civilized states. Moreover, although ordinary soil is soon exhausted unless its pro-

TIME CHART NO. 3. THE EARLIEST CIVILIZATIONS

	Central Civilizations			Separated Civilizations
	Egypt	Crete and Ægean Region	Western Asia	
	Stone Age lasting many thousands of years (see Time Charts 1 and 2)			Stone Age
About 4000 B.C.	Remains of pottery, stone tools, and occasional copper implements show agricultural civilization already in full swing, and New Stone Age merging into Copper Age, before 4000 B.C., in Egypt, Crete, Asia Minor, and Mesopotamia.			Agricultural and pastoral civilizations of New Stone Age type developing in Europe, China, Central America, and elsewhere.
About 3500 B.C. to About 3000 B.C.	Inscriptions and beginning of recorded history. Union of Upper and Lower Egypt. Rapid development of architecture.	Bronze Age beginning. Crete trading with Egypt and Ægean lands.	Bronze Age beginning. Inscriptions and beginning of recorded history. Rivalry among agricultural city-states in Sumer and Akkad.	
	During period 3000–2000 B.C., bronze comes into general use and great civilized states arise			
About 3000 B.C. to About 2500 B.C. to 2000 B.C.	Old Kingdom flourishing. Building of Pyramids. Decline of Old Kingdom. Period of feudalism and disunity (2630–2400 B.C.). Middle Kingdom (2400–2000 B.C.). Expansion southward. Great irrigation works resulting in remarkable prosperity.	Bronze Age culture developing	Attempts to consolidate city-states of Sumer and Akkad. Kingdoms rise and fall in Mesopotamia. Sargon of Agade (2872 B.C.). Kingdom of Ur destroyed (2300 B.C.). Rise of Babylon. Hammurabi (2123–2081 B.C.).	Bronze Age spreading in Europe. China becoming a great civilized nation.

	During period 2000–1500 B.C., Bronze Age civilizations flourish. Barbarian invasions bring the horse into general use.			
2000 B.C. to 1500 B.C.	Hyksos rule in Egypt (1800–1580 B.C.). New Kingdom established (1580 B.C.). XVIIIth Dynasty. Thutmose I (1545–1514 B.C.).	Crete the center of a maritime empire. Climax of Minoan Civilization (1600–1400 B.C.).	Rule of Kassite barbarians in Mesopotamia (1746–1169 B.C.).	
	During period 1500–1000 B.C., the use of iron gradually spreads throughout these regions. The introduction of iron weapons and the use of the horse revolutionize warfare and result in more extensive conquests, larger empires, and numerous migrations of peoples.			
1500 B.C. to 1000 B.C.	Thutmose III (1501–1447 B.C.). Conquests in Syria. Magnificent buildings and highly developed art, literature, agriculture, and trade. Exodus of Israelites (13th cent.). Decline of Egyptian Monarchy.	Destruction of Cnossus (1400 B.C.). Mycenæan Age (1400–1200 B.C.). Trojan War (1200 B.C.) and Homeric Age. Dawn of Iron Age. Dorian Invasions of Greece and Crete. Ionian Migration.	Use of iron and rise of Hittite Empire in Asia Minor. Rise of Assyria. Development of Phœnician commerce. Migrations in Asia Minor and Syria. Wars of Hebrews and Philistines in Palestine.	China beginning to use copper and bronze. Aryans in India (*Rig Veda*). Aryans (Iranians) in Persia (*Zend Avesta*). Chóu Dynasty in China. Maya culture developing in Central America.

ductivity is preserved by scientific crop rotation or by artificial fertilizers, river flats such as Egypt and Mesopotamia were kept constantly fertile, throughout thousands of years, because the rivers annually deposited fresh soil. In such lands men could settle down permanently and build cities.

Irrigation and Government. — These lands have one other peculiarity. Lacking rain, they require irrigation. In Mesopotamia to-day there are luxuriant palm trees and flourishing crops along the fringes of the rivers and canals, but much of the plain between the rivers is an uninhabited desert. In the midst of that barren region, however, there are scores of mounds which are the ruins of ancient cities, and there are traces of a network of ancient canals. These ruins show that what is now a dreary waste was once covered with golden wheatfields and date palms and dotted with cities which depended for their very life on careful irrigation. Now any extensive system of irrigation requires organized coöperation. Large numbers of men must labor systematically to dig the canals and to keep them from being clogged up with mud. In other words, large populations can live in countries like Egypt and Mesopotamia only if they have governments strong enough to deal with the problem of irrigation.

The Sumerians. — About the earliest inhabitants of Mesopotamia we know very little. Long before any historical documents were written, the people whom we call the Sumerians (sū-mē′rĭ-ănz) settled in the warm and fertile river flats of southern Mesopotamia, in the regions called Sumer (sū′mẽr, in the extreme south) and Akkad (ăk′ăd, just north of Sumer). They were rather stocky men and women, these Sumerians, inclined to be somewhat stout, and with short, thickset necks, retreating foreheads, prominent and slightly hooked noses, thin lips, and large eyes. So, at least, they portrayed themselves in pictures and statuettes. The men wore short linen kilts, as the Egyptians did, and the women had dresses draped from the shoulder, often with rows of ruffles on the skirt. Like the Egyptians the Sumerians were farmers, growing wheat and barley, herding dairy cattle, weaving cloth, and making pottery jars. Like the Egyptians, too, these people used stone tools, but were familiar with copper even before

4000 B.C. They made remarkable copper figures of lions and bulls.

Sumerian Writing. — The Sumerians had a system of writing which may have been as old as the Egyptian system. Originally consisting of pictures, it had been simplified until the signs ceased to be real pictures, and some of them indicated the sounds of syllables rather than whole words. Instead of an alphabet of twenty-six letters, the Sumerians had no fewer than 550 different characters, and to write at all well a scribe had to learn at least 300. Perhaps that is why there were professional writers, the scribes. The earliest known Sumerian inscriptions are supposed to have been written about 3600 B.C., as compared with the earliest



CUNEIFORM TABLETS

Egyptian documents dating from about 3500 B.C.; but in both cases writing probably goes back a number of centuries earlier.

The first Sumerian writing was engraved on stone, but as stone was rather scarce in their land, and as they had no papyrus, the Sumerians hit on the ingenious idea of writing on soft clay tablets, which could then be hardened by baking. If you try to scratch lines on soft clay you will discover why the Sumerians soon abandoned that method, and learned to press lines into the clay with a stylus, a sharp-edged piece of reed about as big as a pencil. When one end of this was pressed into the clay, it left a wedge-shaped impression. That is why this kind of writing became known as *cuneiform* (kū-nē′ĭ-fôrm), from the Latin word *cuneus*, wedge.

Thus the Sumerians wrote on their clay tablets; it is literally true to say that they wrote their business contracts and their records and their letters on bricks. Instead of making a carbon copy of a letter or a deed, they would make one tablet, bake it, and then press soft clay against it so as to make a cast of it. In some ways it was a clumsy system. The letter-carrier had no light burden, and a library had to be rather large. But it was rapid and cheap enough, and above all the clay tablets never faded or became worm-eaten, like modern books.

Sumerian Cities. — Cities, like letters, were made of brick, because of the scarcity of stone. Perhaps the houses of the common people were often simply reed huts such as you can see to-day in parts of Mesopotamia. Temples and palaces, however, and the houses of the rich, and the city walls as well, were built largely of brick, on the mounds that still dot the Mesopotamian plain. Each city was governed by a "patesi" (pä-tā′sē) who acted as the chief judge, lawgiver, and administrator, and at the same time as the earthly representative of the city's god. If the patesi of one city succeeded in conquering the neighboring cities, he assumed the title "Lugal" (lōō′găl), meaning "great man" or king.

Temples and Religion. — Religion and politics went hand in hand. The gods were very human beings, who gratefully received pious offerings of meat, grain, beer, and wine, and in return gave protection to the city and good crops to the farmer. Each god had his favorite city. Larsa was the city of the sun-god (Babbar); Eridu, the abode of the water-god (Enki); and Nippur had the chief temple of the earth-god (Enlil). Some of the temples were huge structures, with lofty towers looking out over the plain, with numerous rooms for priests and pilgrims, and walls and moats for protection against enemies. Each temple had its scribes and servants, its seers to discover the secrets of the future by examining the livers and other internal organs of animals or by reading the stars, its singers to chant, and its musicians to play on the lyre, the drum, the cymbals, the tambourine, or the reed flute. The temples were, in a way, libraries and universities, too, for in them old records were kept and their priests were the learned men. The temples owned lands and cattle, also, and levied taxes on the

people, and even lent money and grain to farmers at a high rate of interest. It was a curious mixture, this Sumerian religion, of business, politics, and worship. We might add superstition and immorality, for the people were much given to magic, witchcraft, charms, and omens, and some of the practices connected with religion were vicious and immoral.

City-States of Sumer and Akkad. — The Sumerians do not seem to have been great in statesmanship and war. Perhaps they were too much interested in religion, agriculture, and irrigation. Their city-states were loosely federated, and usually the king of one of them was regarded as head of the whole country, or a large part of it; but his power could not have been great, and the leadership was seized first by one city, then by another. It remained for a Semitic king, Sargon (sär′gŏn) of Agade, to conquer and weld the city-states of the plain into a powerful kingdom. But before we describe Sargon's career, a few words should be said about the Semitic peoples to whom he belonged.

Semites of the Grasslands. — West of the fertile Mesopotamian plain stretches the Syrian Desert, extending westward to the mountain ridges that parallel the Mediterranean shore, and merging on the south into the vast desert plateau of Arabia. When we say desert, we do not mean absolutely sterile, uninhabited country. Here and there in the desert are oases, with palm trees and perhaps even grainfields. Moreover, there are broad areas of grassland, where flowers and grass cover the land in the spring, only to shrivel up in the fierce, dry heat of summer. On such lands sheep and horses can graze, but they must be ever on the move, seeking fresh pastures. The people of desert and grassland, therefore, are usually tent-dwellers and nomads, moving from pasture to pasture. They are brave warriors, one tribe fighting against another for pastures and booty. When one tribe is driven from its pastures by another, or when the scanty grass proves insufficient to support the herds, the tribesmen may perhaps be driven to migrate. All through history there has been a tendency for the nomads of the Arabian-Syrian deserts and grasslands to force their way either westward into Syria, Palestine, and even Egypt, or eastward into Mesopotamia, where the wealth of the agricul-

tural plain offered tempting booty to the invader. This was one of the perils to which the Sumerians were always exposed, and to which they eventually were victims.

Semites in Akkad. — Some of the earliest Sumerian documents show us that such an invasion, or perhaps several invasions, had planted an alien aristocracy in some of the Sumerian cities. The invaders spoke a language which has been called Babylonian or Akkadian; and as this is a Semitic (sĕ-mĭt′ĭk) language, the invaders have been called Semites (sĕm′īts). Apparently they were barbarians with no knowledge of writing, for they borrowed the Sumerian cuneiform writing to express their own language, rather clumsily, it must be confessed. But the old Sumerian remained the language of literature and learning and theology. The Semites even adopted the Sumerian religion, identifying the Sumerian gods with their own deities, and giving them Semitic names. Such Sumerianized Semites formed the ruling class in Babylon (băb′ĭ-lŏn) and other cities in the land called Akkad (see the map), as well as farther north in the upper Tigris Valley. But the southern land of Sumer remained Sumerian.

Sargon of Agade. — It was a Semitic king, as we have said, who welded the Mesopotamian city-states into a strong kingdom. His name was Sargon of Agade (about 2872 B.C.).[1] At the head of an army of bearded warriors armed with spears, swords, bows and arrows, Sargon conquered all the cities in Akkad and Sumer and also Susa and other towns of the land of Elam (ē′lăm), north of the Gulf. Then turning to the north and west he marched up the Euphrates Valley until he won the "silver mountains" (probably the Taurus Mountains, famed for their silver mines, and situated just north of the northeastern corner of the Mediterranean) and the "cedar forests" (of the Lebanon mountain range, in Syria). His empire reached from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean, and from the southern deserts to the northern mountains. In his pride he built the new city of Agade (ă-gä′dĕ, between the Tigris and Euphrates near the modern Bagdad) for his capital, tracing its outer walls with sacred soil taken from the

[1] The date of Sargon's accession is usually given as 2872 B.C., but some recently discovered inscriptions have led one authority to suggest 2752 B.C.

SUMER, AKKAD, AND THE BABYLONIAN EMPIRE OF SARGON I, ABOUT 2800 B.C.

old city of Babylon. From inscriptions we learn how the empire was administered. Each conquered city was put under a patesi, a sort of viceroy who was also a priest, and who sent the Emperor tribute in the form of gold and silver, grain and cattle, salt, and fish — and laborers to work on the irrigation canals or to help build temples. Not without difficulty or cruelty was Sargon's empire held together. In one case, so we read in the old inscriptions, he turned a rebellious city "into dust and heaps of ruins; he destroyed even the resting places of the birds."

The Dragon of the Mountain. — Not long afterwards the empire fell apart, and barbarians from the mountains east of Mesopotamia held sway over the wealthy cities of Sumer and Akkad for more than a century. Many a temple was demolished, cities were looted and destroyed, and the land lived in terror. How they felt may be judged by the name which the Sumerians gave to their conqueror — "dragon of the mountain, enemy of the gods." In the course of later history, many a "dragon" was to come down from those same Persian mountains, to pillage and conquer the plain.

At last a Sumerian leader arose to expel the mountaineers, and for a century the empire of Sargon was reunited, but under Sumerian rather than Semitic rule, and with the capital no longer at Agade, but at the old Sumerian city of Ur, sacred to the moon-god. To guard against Semitic invasions from the desert, one of these kings of Ur built a great wall on his western border. Unfortunately he forgot whence the "dragon of the mountain" had come — from the east. It was an army from the hill country of Elam that overthrew Ur and carried off as prisoner the last of the Sumerian kings.

Hammurabi. — There followed a period of about two hundred years, during which rival dynasties rose and fell, and there were frequent wars and raids for plunder. Most of the time, the Semitic-Sumerian cities in Akkad were dominant. One of these, Babylon, gave birth to the most famous ruler of ancient Mesopotamia, King Hammurabi (hȧm-o͝o-rä′bē, 2123–2081 B.C.). Coming to the throne as king of the city-state of Babylon, he conquered all Akkad and Sumer and drove the Elamites back into

their mountains, so that he ruled from the Persian Gulf up to Babylon; and even Assyria, the country north of Babylon, was under his scepter.

Successful as he was in war, however, Hammurabi was more the statesman than the conqueror. He was intensely proud of the great canal he dug. "I dug the canal," he boasted, "which bringeth copious water to the lands of Sumer and Akkad. Its banks on both sides I turned into grainfields, I heaped up piles of grain, and I provided unfailing water for the lands of Sumer and Akkad." He prided himself even more on the splendid temples he built.

Hammurabi's Code of Laws. — But Hammurabi is best known to us not for his wars, nor for his canal, nor for his temples, but rather for his Code of Laws, a copy of which was found forty centuries after it was compiled, carved on a block of black stone. There had been earlier codes among the Sumerians and among the Egyptians, we may be sure, but Hammurabi's is the first important set of laws the original words of which happened to be preserved. It is much simpler than modern codes of law; in fact it consists of only 285 laws, whereas nowadays our laws are thousands in number.

The penalties were harsh, and often based on the principle of "an eye for an eye." For example, if a man killed another man's daughter, his own daughter must be put to death. The death penalty was prescribed for burglars and brigands, for a man who helped slaves to escape from their masters, and for many other crimes. A man who struck his superior received sixty strokes of an ox-hide whip. For minor offenses there were fines. When a man was accused of sorcery without sufficient evidence, he had to leap into the river, and if he did not drown he was regarded as innocent. Most cases, however, seem to have been tried in regular courts, before judges, with ample opportunity for both sides to present their pleas and produce witnesses.

The law was especially detailed as regards business affairs and marriage. It actually fixed the wages of carpenters, tailors, brick-makers, masons, shepherds, laborers, and other workers. Marriage, it appears, was a legal contract preceded by interesting formalities. First the hopeful suitor must call on his prospective father-in-law

bringing a sum of silver, which would be returned in case of divorce. In return, the father-in-law must give the bride her dowry and trousseau. If either the bride or the groom proved fickle, a fine was imposed for breach of promise. But if all went well, they were married before witnesses, until death or divorce. If the woman was ill-treated, she could take back her dowry and return to her father's house. Although in general men had more rights, women had legal rights that were carefully protected in the code. From this and other sources we learn that women could buy, own, and sell property, and that they often engaged in business.

Business life was highly developed at this time. The code gives a number of laws dealing with business contracts, loans, debts, and so on. Moreover, clay tablets have been found containing Babylonian partnership contracts, mortgages, and deeds of sale for land. Loans were sometimes made in the form of grain at interest of 33⅓% a year, and sometimes in silver at the rate of 20%. Under the protection of Hammurabi's laws, business flourished, as thousands of Babylonian tablets show. Exports of grain, oil, dates, leather, and pottery jars were carried to neighboring countries by caravans of heavy-laden donkeys. And in return Babylonia received gold, silver, copper, stone, wood, salt, slaves, and many other goods.

The Code of Hammurabi shows us an undemocratic society in which there were sharply defined social classes. The nobles were probably descendants of Semite conquerors. The commoners or middle classes included merchants and workmen generally. Below them were the slaves, who could be bought and sold and even mortgaged, and who were either branded or tagged to show whose property they were.

Hammurabi's Successors. — We need not follow in detail the fortunes of Hammurabi's successors, who seem to have been interested chiefly in building temples and making rich gifts to the gods, or in building towns and digging new irrigation canals. The last of them was overthrown in the year 1926 B.C. by warlike invaders from the northwest, the Hittites, of whom we shall hear more.[1]

[1] See pp. 84–85.

Barbarians, Horses, and Empires

The Civilized Kingdoms. — The preceding sections have traced the rise of great civilized kingdoms in Egypt and Babylonia. In both cases the rich soil of river-made plains favored the growth of a thickly settled farming population, and this farming population had been united into a highly civilized kingdom. At about the same time, civilization was growing up in various other lands of the Near East, especially Crete and the Ægean Islands, about which more will be said in another section.

The Kassites in Babylonia. — The story of Egypt and the story of Babylonia were both interrupted in the eighteenth century B.C. by barbarian invaders. In the case of Babylonia, the invaders were the Kassites (kăs′īts) — hardy barbarians from the mountains east of the Tigris, who came first as harvest-laborers, then as brigands and raiders, and at last as conquerors. It was the old story of the barbarian seizing the wealth of the civilized plain. Just as the earlier Semite invaders had adopted Sumerian civilization, the Kassites adopted the gods and the customs of the people they conquered, and tried to learn the Semitic Akkadian (or Babylonian) language of commerce and administration, as well as the Sumerian language, which by this time had become a dead language and was used chiefly by the priests and learned men.

From 1746 to 1169 B.C., almost six centuries, the Kassite conquerors kept their grip on Babylon and the other cities of Akkad and Sumer. The immediate effects of this barbarian conquest were internal disorder, quarrels among petty chieftains, and a lowering of civilization.

The Hyksos in Egypt. — At almost exactly the same time, about 1800 B.C., Egypt was invaded by barbarians who came across the Sinai Peninsula from Syria. They were called Hyksos (hĭk′sōs) or "princes of the desert" by the fear-struck Egyptians. One can well imagine how panic-stricken Egyptian foot-soldiers felt, armed only with arrows and weak bows, copper hatchets, bronze daggers, and broad-bladed spears, when Hyksos charioteers bore down upon them, slashing right and left with deadly curved swords of tempered bronze. Shocked and defeated, the proud people of

the Nile soon found themselves enslaved, their property confiscated, their land ravaged, their sacred temples profaned, their ancestral tombs looted, their palaces destroyed. It was an experience that left bitterness and anger among them for centuries and centuries.

While Hyksos kings ruled in Lower Egypt, a native Egyptian prince at Thebes, far up the river, declared his independence, rallied patriotic Egyptians to his standard, and attacked the alien king. After a long and bloody war the Hyksos were finally expelled from the Nile Delta and driven across Sinai into Palestine and Syria, about 1580 B.C.

The Horse and the Chariot. — Before the Hyksos and Kassite invasions, the civilized farmers of Egypt and Babylonia had not used the horse either in war or in peaceful industry. The Kas-



Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

EGYPTIAN WAR CHARIOT

From a picture on the chariot of Thutmose IV, found in his tomb. The Pharaoh standing in his chariot is shooting an arrow and at the same time he is guiding his two horses by reins tied around his body. Thutmose IV lived in the fifteenth century B.C.

sites and Hyksos, however, were both horse-using peoples, and it was no doubt due to the horse that they were able to swoop down upon the farmers so successfully. The coming of the horse was an event of the greatest importance. Both the Egyptians and the Babylonians now began to use horses, harnessed to war chariots. Conquerors could now ride swiftly to win distant provinces. In the old days a conquest had usually been little more than a plundering raid, because, when the conquering army returned home, the conquered land could recover its independence. With the horse in use, however, messengers could be sent back and forth more quickly between the conquered land and the conqueror, and forces could be sent out swiftly to crush rebellion. Even more important, as the horse was used more and more extensively, it brought the lands of the Near East into closer touch with each other, with the result that commerce and culture rapidly grew.

The Egyptian Empire

Conquests under the XVIIIth Dynasty. — After the Hyksos invasion, Egypt entered upon a career of conquest. In their long struggle against the Hyksos rulers, the Egyptians themselves became more warlike. Their archers learned from the Hyksos the advantage of carrying an extra supply of arrows in a quiver, and they earned a reputation for deadly aim. Horse-drawn chariots, which the Hyksos had brought into Egypt, were adopted by the Egyptian military leaders. When the Hyksos were finally expelled from the country, the prince who had led the Egyptians to victory made himself king of Egypt, about 1580 B.C., and established his capital at the city of Thebes, far up the Nile, more than four hundred miles from the sea. Several of his successors, who belonged to the famous royal family known as the XVIIIth Dynasty, proved to be brilliant generals and succeeded in conquering Nubia, to the south of Egypt, and Palestine and Syria to the northeast. Thutmose I (thŭt′mōs) and Thutmose III, the most successful of these warlike Pharaohs, had boastful records of their victories engraved in hieroglyphic inscriptions upon splendid monuments and temples. Their warlike deeds, however, were

probably exaggerated. The great army with which the Pharaoh conquered Syria was probably a body of no more than twenty or thirty thousand men. The numerous "kings" vanquished by Thutmose III were really only petty rulers of small districts, and might better be called chieftains. The conquered lands were not really made a part of Egypt, but were compelled to pay tribute and to acknowledge the Pharaoh's overlordship. Rebellions were very frequent, and Syria had to be reconquered time and time again.

THUTMOSE III

Nevertheless these conquests had certain results. (1) They helped to spread Egyptian civilization southward into Nubia and northeastward into Palestine and Syria. (2) They increased the wealth of the Egyptian Pharaoh. From Syria and from Nubia he received heavy tribute in gold and silver. Slaves he had in abundance, for captives of war were enslaved. (3) By contact with other peoples with different ideas, customs, and religions, the Egyptians broadened their own minds.

Art and Architecture. — With treasuries overflowing with the tax payments of a prosperous Egypt and with tribute from conquered lands, the Pharaohs of the Empire lavished their wealth on glorious works of art. At Thebes, the capital, they constructed beautiful temples in honor of the god Amon. The greatest of these, now known as the temple of Karnak, was an enormous building, with massive columns of granite supporting the roof.

Avenues of sphinxes led from the temples to the river; one of them is shown in the illustration. No city in all the world could rival Thebes, the "city of a hundred gates."

Several general points regarding the art and architecture of this period may be noted here. (1) Art and architecture were chiefly intended to glorify the Pharaoh and the gods. The largest and finest buildings were temples for the gods and tomb-temples

Avenue of Sphinxes at Thebes

for the Pharaohs. (2) The architects and stoneworkers showed astonishing skill in their ability to erect gigantic statues and to construct immense temples with extremely large blocks of stone. They could cut a block of granite weighing a thousand tons and transport it from the distant quarries, far up the Nile, to Thebes, in order to use it in the form of a ninety-foot statue. In the great temple of Karnak some of the columns were 79 feet high and the floor space was larger than that of many a great modern cathedral. (3) In their paintings and sculpture Egyptian artists followed

certain "conventions" or fixed rules. For instance, they felt that they must always portray gods and kings in certain stiffly dignified positions. In making a picture of a house, they tried to show all the rooms, instead of drawing it in perspective as it naturally appears to the eye. In short, they did not try to make pictures and statues look absolutely natural. Nevertheless, the human faces and some of the figures have a wonderfully lifelike appearance. (4) The Egyptians usually covered the walls of temples with hieroglyphic inscriptions and with pictures, especially battle scenes, carved in stone and colorfully painted. These inscriptions and pictures are not only artistic; they also serve as valuable historical records. (5) In their massive architecture, their stone sculpture, and their painting, the Egyptians were pioneers. Their work was copied in many countries and it stimulated artistic progress throughout the ancient Near East.

Religion. — Important religious changes occurred during the Empire. In order to understand them it is necessary to review the development of Egyptian religion. (1) To begin with, it must be remembered that the Egyptians had many gods. Such a religion is termed *polytheism* (pŏl′ĭ-thē-ĭz′m). Each locality had its special god; there were thousands of gods. Some were represented by birds, animals, and reptiles, such as the hawk, the jackal, and the crocodile. Others typified the forces of nature: for instance, Re (rā) was the sun-god and Osiris (ō-sī′rĭs) the river-god. (2) During the Old Kingdom, the sun-god, *Re*, was worshipped as the greatest god, and the Pharaoh was regarded as the son of Re. (3) When the Empire was established and the capital moved to Thebes, the Theban god *Amon* (ä′mŏn) became supreme, splendid temples were built in his honor, and his high priest became the chief priest of the Empire. Re, however, was partly identified with Amon, and the two names were often written together in the form Amon-Re, as if they belonged to a single god. The Egyptians frequently blended gods together in this way. (4) Many interesting stories or *myths* were told about the marriages, quarrels, and other doings of the gods and goddesses. In some of these myths and in various hymns that were composed, as time went on, the religious ideas of educated Egyptians

showed progress toward higher conceptions of the gods. (5) From the beginning the Egyptians believed in a *future life*, and this belief led to the practice of embalming or mummifying the body as well as to the building of elaborate tombs. Moreover, kings and wealthy nobles often gave large amounts of property as endowments to support priests and special temples, because it was believed that the *ka* or immortal part of a dead man needed certain religious services. Thus more and more land and wealth came into the possession of the priests. (6) Even during the Old Kingdom, but still more in the Middle Kingdom and under the Empire,

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

JUDGMENT OF THE DEAD

This picture from an ancient Egyptian papyrus (about 1500 B.C.) shows Anubis, the jackal-headed god of the dead, weighing the heart of the deceased (whose picture is at the extreme left). Thoth, the ibis-headed god of learning, stands at the right, with a scribe's palette and brush, ready to record the verdict. The feather in the right-hand scale represents right and truth, against which the heart, in an urn in the other scale, is to be balanced.

the belief became popular that after death a man's heart would be weighed in the scales of judgment, before the throne of Osiris the King of the Dead. Once this test was passed, the deceased soul became identified with Osiris, and entered a happy land. But for the guilty soul, a hideous monster waited with yawning crocodile-jaws. In this there is some idea of a *future judgment*, in which men will be happy if they have lived blameless lives, and punished if they have committed such sins as murder, theft, idleness, falsehood, killing sacred beasts, and blasphemy.

Curiously enough, however, the Egyptians reconciled this admirable moral idea with a most absurd form of magic. They believed that even if one had not lived a blameless life he might deny his sins and deceive Osiris by reciting certain magical phrases or spells. These were written on a piece of papyrus and laid beside him in the tomb, so that he could have them ready. These spells are often called *The Book of the Dead.* Other spells would enable the dead man to assume any shape he wished, to conjure snakes away, to get a ferry over to the east side of the sky, and so on. This crude superstition was closely related to the *magic* which the Egyptians practised in daily life, to cure their diseases. Egyptian doctors or medicine-men gave strange doses to their patients, but more important than drugs were magical words. By magic they claimed to be able to cure all sorts of ills, and even to prevent the hair from falling out; still more amazing, they had charms by which an envious woman could make a beautiful rival lose her hair.

Religious Reforms of Ikhnaton. — We are now in a position to understand the religious reforms that were made by a young man, barely twenty years old, who inherited the crown as Pharaoh at a time when the templed city of Thebes was in all its glory and the Empire at its height of pride and wealth. This youthful ruler, whose name was Amenhotep IV (1375–1358 B.C.), believed that there was only one god, the sun-god, who created all things and watched over the welfare of the whole world. Previously the sun-god had been worshipped under the name of Amon-Re, but there had been many other gods. Amenhotep (ăm′ĕn-hō′tĕp) called the sun-god Aton (ä′tŏn), and tried to stop the worship of all other gods. He even closed the old temples, expelled the priests of Amon and other gods, and built a new capital city named in honor of Aton. He changed his own name from Amenhotep, meaning "Amon is pleased," to Ikhnaton (ĭk′nä-tŏn), meaning "Aton is satisfied." Ikhnaton's ideas, however, were in advance of his age. The superstitions of the common people and the hatred of the priests he had expelled were obstacles too great for him to overcome.

Tutenkhamon. — No sooner had the reformer died than his

son-in-law moved the royal court back to Thebes and reopened the Theban temples of Amon. Though his reign was short and uneventful save for the restoration of Amon, this ruler's name, Tutenkhamon (tōōt-ĕngk-ä′mȯn, 1358–1352 B.C.) has become almost a household word to-day, because of the discovery of his tomb in 1922 and the wealth of artistic work that was found in it. There were chariots of sheet gold, marvellously carved couches, and a golden chair or throne embellished with a picture, in glass and faïence, of the Pharaoh and his queen. There were alabaster vases, gorgeous robes, walking sticks of solid gold and silver. Gold-covered monsters and graceful golden goddesses guarded the King's remains. The body, a mummy of course, was enclosed in a series of coffins rich beyond all imagination.

A Gold Statue of the Great God Amon

It was found at Karnak, and dates from the reign of Thutmose III.

Wealth and Power of the Priesthood. — After Tutenkhamon the old gods continued to hold sway unchallenged, and their priests grew ever more powerful. They continued to receive, or perhaps to exact, large offerings from the royal treasury until it was exhausted. The property of the temples increased until (about 1200 B.C.) it included a seventh of all the agricultural land of Egypt, half a million cattle, 169 towns, numerous workshops, almost a hundred ships, and over a hundred thousand slaves. Merely supporting the many temples, keeping them in repair, and maintaining the various priesthoods, was a severe economic drain on the country; yet, in addition,

each Pharaoh considered it his duty to build new temples even if he had to destroy the most beautiful buildings of his forefathers in order to obtain stone more cheaply than by quarrying it, and even though he might have to let his workmen go without their monthly pay of fifty sacks of grain.

Economic Life. — *Agriculture* was continued by the farmers of the Nile Valley, without much change in methods, regardless of how dynasties rose and fell or how conquests were made and lost. Farming was the foundation of Egyptian civilization, the very basis of the wealth and greatness of the Pharaohs. The rich black soil, kept fertile by the Nile floods, was cultivated with a simple wooden plough — a wooden ploughshare with a long pole, hitched to a pair of oxen. The wheat and barley were sown by hand, and then sheep were driven over the field to tread the seed in. When the grain was ripe, it was cut with a sickle, the sheaves were carried by donkeys to the threshing floor, to be trampled upon by oxen, whose heavy tread loosened the kernels of grain from the stalks and the chaff. Vegetables, fruits, and flax were also cultivated extensively. As long as the irrigation canals were kept in good repair, and patient farmers did their work, Egypt was rich.

Much of the land was the personal property of the Pharaoh, and was cultivated by his servants and slaves; large estates were owned by the priesthood, too, as we have seen, and by wealthy nobles. King, priesthood, and nobles likewise owned vast herds of cattle and flocks of sheep. A large part of the farming population must have consisted of laborers who worked on the great estates or watched the flocks and herds.

Industry increased rapidly as Egyptian civilization progressed. Many thousands of stone-cutters, masons, brickmakers, potters, carpenters, jewelers, painters, goldsmiths, coppersmiths, and other skilled craftsmen were employed in satisfying the needs of the royal court, the temples, and the rich. Moreover, as trade increased, fine vases, papyrus, linen, and jewelry were produced in large quantities for export.

Trade with foreign countries began in very early times. Even in the predynastic period, Egyptian manufactures were being shipped to Crete, and as early as 3000 B.C. Egypt was receiving

gold from mines in Europe. From Syria Egypt bought cattle, fish, wine, incense, even ships and carriages. From Nubia, to the south, came ivory, gold, and ostrich feathers. In the fifteenth century B.C. Queen Hatshepshut (hät-shĕp′shŭt), the first great woman whose name appears in history — sent five Egyptian ships southward through the Red Sea to the land of Punt, which is probably the region now known as Somaliland (sō-mä′lē-lănd), to obtain incense and myrrh trees, ebony, cinnamon, and other goods. Even before the queen's expedition, a ship canal had been dug from the Nile to the northern end of the Red Sea, so that the Mediterranean, the Nile, and the Red Sea were connected.

QUEEN HATSHEPSHUT

At first foreign trade and ordinary business within Egypt were conducted by means of *barter*, which means the exchange of one kind of goods for another, without any use of money. Thus a jar might be exchanged for some fish, or a cow for some grain. (See picture on page 48.) Later, rings of metal were used for large purchases. But coined money such as we now use was a much later invention.

Rise of the Middle Class. — With the growth of trade and industry there was a corresponding growth of what we might call the middle class. In the early days there was probably not much of a middle class between the common laborers and farmers on one hand, and the rich officials and nobles on the other hand. Toward the end of the Old Kingdom, however, a considerable number of traders or business men became rich enough to have much influence and to be envied by the aristocrats. Then, too,

the skilled manufacturers were becoming numerous, and were not willing to have their rights disregarded. As a result there was a good deal of discontent and social unrest. During the Middle Kingdom, this rising class of manufacturers and business men grew still more important. Finally, in the time of the Empire, the middle class began to have considerable influence on the government. Middle-class boys were sent to school to learn writing, so that they could become "scribes" and obtain positions in the government. Many of the government officials were selected from this class, instead of from the old nobility.

End of Egyptian Independence. — Towards the year 1200 B.C. the Egyptian Empire grew weak. The army now consisted largely of captives, branded with the Pharaoh's name, and of hired alien troops. Pharaohs of this period considered themselves fortunate, and fervently thanked Amon, if they could only ward off the barbarian invasions that became more and more frequent. Still later we find Egypt divided, with a separate kingdom in the delta, and the Pharaoh at Thebes a mere tool in the hands of the high priest of Amon, who usurped the throne soon afterwards. For a few dismal centuries the country remained weak and misgoverned, often divided. It was conquered, as we shall see, by the Assyrians in the year 670 B.C., but was held in subjection by them only for a few years; after that, it was a rich prize for successive conquerors — Persians (525 B.C.), Macedonians (332 B.C.), and Romans (30 B.C.).

The Greatness of Egypt. — It would be a mistake to regard the decline of Egypt's military power and the loss of her independence as indicating the end of her importance or her influence. The greatness of Egypt was not in war but in agriculture, industry, art, and thought. In these things Egypt continued to be great, long after she had been conquered. Her influence over other ancient but younger civilizations and, through them, her influence upon us, cannot be fully traced nor accurately measured, but we know that it was very great.

Her pottery, perhaps the first to be made by men, influenced the styles of potters in other lands and is still copied; glass and glazing were her inventions. The massive stonework of her masons

was imitated; she used colonnades long before the Greeks and invented the arch before the Romans. Her sculptors made the earliest statues that can be regarded as artistic masterpieces. Her wealth, industrial development, and business organization, as well as her luxury and the pomp of her Pharaohs, must have influenced and stimulated her neighbors. She gave the modern world its

THE GREAT SPHINX
For description, see footnote on page 45.

calendar of twelve months and 365 days. She worked out the beginnings of arithmetic and geometry.

Arithmetic. — In Egyptian hands, we may add by way of explanation, arithmetic and geometry were practical rather than abstract subjects. The Egyptian had a decimal system of numbers with different signs for 1, for 10, for 100, and so on, but for 2 he had to write two ones, or for 423 he would write four hundreds, two

tens, and three ones. He could add and subtract, divide and multiply.

Geometry. — As the land had to be surveyed or marked out into fields each year, after the Nile flood, the Egyptians early learned some of the practical rules of geometry. They knew how to find the areas of rectangles and triangles, and could find the area of a circle closely enough for practical purposes by squaring $\frac{8}{9}$ of the diameter. In measuring the quantity of grain in a heap or in a storehouse, they learned how to compute the contents of cubes, cylinders, and other bodies. This practical knowledge the Greeks later put in logical, systematic form, and transmitted to us.

Ægean Civilization and the Sea-Kings of Crete

Early Trade Between Crete and Egypt. — In the eastern Mediterranean, just south of Greece and northwest of Egypt, lies the long mountainous island of Crete (krēt). Until the very close of the nineteenth century, historians hardly suspected that Crete was the home of an ancient empire. But since then, buried ruins have been uncovered that tell an eloquent tale of empire and of sudden tragedy. Before the pyramids were built in Egypt, and before Sargon of Agade established his empire in Mesopotamia, the inhabitants of Crete were beginning to use copper, and were making pottery jars, and building villages, and perhaps venturing out to sea in ships. Whether they

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

Vase of the Bronze Age from Cyprus
Showing chariot and horses.

sailed to Egypt, or the Egyptians came to Crete, we do not know, but it is clear that contact was established between the two countries, and we know that both had venturesome sailors. We know, too, that Cretan civilization was strongly influenced and greatly stimulated by the more magnificent culture of the Egyptians. Cretan manufacturers of pottery, of weapons, and of various metal goods learned much from Egypt. Cretan artists improved their skill by copying and trying to improve on Egyptian designs. Crete became the chief channel through which Egyptian culture was spread to the north.

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

THE SNAKE-GODDESS

A faïence figure, dating from about 1800–1500 B.C. Typical Minoan costume.

The Minoan Age in Crete. — For more than two thousand years, from about 3400 to about 1200 B.C., Crete was one of the most important centers of civilization. This long period is often termed the Minoan (mī-nō′ăn) Age, because the king of Crete was called Minos (mī′nŏs) in Greek legends. The Minoan Age of Crete covers the same period, roughly speaking, as the history of Egypt from the beginning of the Old Kingdom to the decline of the Empire, and the history of Mesopotamia from the age of Sumerian city-states down to the end of Kassite rule. (See Time Chart 3.)

Cretan civilization was at its height during the period from about 2000 to 1400 B.C. Excavations among the ancient ruins in Crete show that at this time there were great and flourishing cities, among which Knossos (nŏs′ŭs) became the most important. Apparently the ruler of Knossos became king of the whole island, and perhaps he possessed colonies in Greece and elsewhere.

The Palace at Knossos. — The ruins of the royal palace at Knossos show that the king had a large staff of officials and clerks,

as well as a force of mechanics, jewelers, artists, and laborers at his command. In the palace storerooms there were rows of huge jars in which were stored olive oil, wine, and grain; probably the taxes were paid to the king in these goods. There were also special chests or safes for the royal treasury. Government records and accounts were written on clay tablets, stacks of which have been found in the palace. These would doubtless tell us much that is now secret about the history of Crete, if anyone should discover how to read the Cretan system of writing.

Industrial Development. — The ruins at Knossos prove that the Cretans reached a high level of industrial skill. They particularly excelled in metalwork and pottery. With copper from Cyprus and tin from distant mines in Europe, they manufactured the finest daggers, swords, and other articles of bronze. Their delicately thin pottery jars, turned on the potter's wheel and gorgeously painted, became famous all over the Near East. Other proofs of Cretan skill may be found in the system of water-supply and drainage with which they equipped the royal palace.

Art. — In art, too, the Cretans made great progress. Instead of continuing to copy Egyptian designs, Cretan artists learned to experiment with new designs and color combinations. The painters decorated the royal palace and the comfortable homes of rich traders with wall-paintings showing feasts, religious ceremonies, athletic contests, houses, princes and servants, animals, flowers, and fish. These pictures, as well as the pictures on Cretan pottery, are noted for their originality and naturalness. The Cretans did not build magnificent temples, nor did they carve great stone statues like those of Egypt; but in their wall-paintings, in the designs painted on their pottery jars, and in the decoration of their metalwork — daggers, swords, cups, and vases — they demonstrated artistic ability of the highest order.

Sea-power and Trade. — Above all, however, Crete was important for her sea-power and trade. In high-prowed ships Cretan sailors ventured not only to Egypt, but to all the coasts of the eastern Mediterranean, and perhaps to the western shores of that great sea. A Cretan trading station with splendid docks was built in Egypt. Cretan colonies were founded in Cyprus, in the

Greek Peninsula, and perhaps in Sicily. The Cretan navy was strong enough to defend these distant colonies, to guard Cretan overseas trade, and to protect the unfortified palace at Knossos. The king at Knossos was truly a "sea-king."

The many merchant ships of Crete carried to foreign lands such exports as copper daggers and swords, silver vases, golden cups, and wine and olive oil sealed in beautiful Cretan jars. In return they imported raw metals, ivory, and luxuries of every kind. Moreover, the Cretans carried cedar timber from Syria and copper from Cyprus to Egypt; they sold Egyptian products to the people of the Ægean (ē-jē′ăn) Islands, of Greece, and perhaps of Italy.

Extension of Ægean Civilization. — By means of their overseas commerce and colonies, the Cretans spread their civilization throughout the islands and coasts of the Ægean Sea. Thus Cretan civilization became a wider Ægean civilization. Especially in the period from 1600 to 1400 B.C. Crete influenced and perhaps ruled the Ægean islands and coasts. Above all we must emphasize the establishment of Cretan colonies on the less civilized Greek Peninsula. Ruins of these colonies have been found in Greece at Mycenæ (mī-sē′nē), Tiryns (tī′rĭnz), and a number of other places. We shall refer to them again in a chapter on the Greek city-states; but we should note here that these towns were centers of Cretan civilization in Greece, and through them this civilization was handed on to the later Greeks. We can only give a few illustrations here of this transfer of civilization. Cretan painting, metalwork, and pottery were extended to Greece; the Cretan lyre was handed on, to become in later times a favorite musical instrument of the Greeks; the Cretan fondness for athletic contests in connection with religious festivals became a marked feature of Greek life; and the Cretan religion, with its worship of a "Great Mother" goddess, strongly influenced the Greek religion.

Fall of Knossos. — A mysterious catastrophe overwhelmed the flourishing island empire of Crete about the year 1400 B.C. The great palace at Knossos was plundered and burned, and the other cities of Crete suffered the same cruel fate. Perhaps there was a rebellion or an earthquake. More likely, however, is the theory that foreign invaders defeated the Cretan navy, swooped down



EARLY CRETAN AND ÆGEAN CIVILIZATIONS

on the island, and carried off rich spoils of gold and silver. It may well be that the foreign invaders were sea-raiders from the Greek Peninsula, perhaps from Mycenæ.

Syria and the Semites

Migrations of Peoples. — The disturbances that occurred between 1400 and 1100 B.C. in the Ægean world of which we have been speaking had an indirect effect on other countries. This was a period of invasions and migrations; bands of adventurers wandered far and wide; peoples driven from their homelands by invaders had to seek new lands in which to settle. To describe all these migrations in detail would be difficult and uninteresting, but one typical case may be mentioned. Some time after the sack of Knossos, there was a great migration southward from the Ægean region. Some of the wanderers went in ships, while others brought their families in clumsy two-wheeled oxcarts, travelling by land southward through Syria. The vanguard was met, defeated, and slaughtered by the army of the Egyptian Pharaoh. But behind these unfortunate pioneers came other immigrants, who settled in Syria and Palestine.

Syria. — Syria (sĭr′ĭ-*ȧ*) is the strip of mountainous country along the eastern coast of the Mediterranean, stretching from the Taurus Mountains on the north to the Sinai (sī′nī) Peninsula on the south. Palestine (păl′ĕs-tīn) is simply the southern part of this land, nearest to Egypt. Though it is bordered by deserts on the east and south, Syria was famed for its herds of cattle and flocks of sheep, its wine, honey, and olive oil, its copper mines, its commerce, and for the fine timber obtained from the cedar-clad slopes of Mount Lebanon (lĕb′*ȧ*-nŏn). All through history Syria has been a battlefield and a commercial highway, because it is a connecting link between Egypt on the south and Asia Minor on the north. In the north, too, it is touched by the great westward bend of the Euphrates, and so it was in ancient times the connecting link between Egypt and Mesopotamia. Armies, merchants, diplomats, and barbarian hordes marched across Syria times without number.

The Melting-Pot of the Ancient World. — The population of such a country, naturally, was very mixed, for it contained rem-

PHŒNICIA AND PALESTINE, ABOUT 1000 B.C.

nants of so many invasions and migrations. Syria was the turbulent melting-pot of the ancient world. Into it came the Philistines (fĭ-lĭs′tĭnz), for instance, from Crete or from Asia Minor; also the Hittites[1] from Asia Minor. But we cannot even list them all. In language, however, the country was more uniform than in blood. The prevailing tongues were dialects strongly resembling each other and belonging to the Semitic type of language.[2] Not only the Hebrews, but also the neighboring peoples and the Arabs were "Semites" in speech. Even the Philistines learned to use a Semitic language.

The Hebrews. — The Hebrews, or Children of Israel, whose sacred writings form the Scriptures of the Jews and the Old Testament of the Christian Bible, were pastoral nomads, with herds

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

EGYPTIAN BRICKMAKERS AND STONE-CUTTERS

At the left, brickmakers are taking mud, which will be mixed with straw or chaff and shaped in a mold to form bricks; the completed bricks are being carried away by the man bearing a yoke. Note the overseer, seated, with his staff. At the right, stone-cutters are trimming blocks of stone and measuring, with a cord, to see whether the surface is true. These wall-paintings from an Egyptian tomb (about 1500 B.C.) show how the Hebrews probably labored during their sojourn in Egypt.

of cattle and flocks of sheep, like other Semitic herdsmen who came into Syria from the grasslands and deserts of the east. The Old Testament tells us how the Israelites went down into Egypt in a time of famine, and multiplied until "the land was filled with them," and were oppressed by Egyptian taskmasters who compelled them to make bricks without straw.[3]

[1] See pp. 84–85. [2] See pp. 55–56.

[3] The Egyptians mixed chopped straw with clay, to make their bricks stronger. What the Egyptians required the Hebrews to do was to gather stubble as a substitute for straw, to be put in the bricks.

The Exodus. — After a time, so the book of Exodus tells us, the Hebrews were led out of Egypt by Moses. After wandering forty years in the wilderness of the Sinai Peninsula, and circling around to the east of Palestine, they were led westward across the Jordan River by the warlike Joshua, and they conquered the Jordan Valley — the heart of Palestine. Egyptian and other non-Jewish records give us very little evidence to compare with this account of the Hebrew conquest of Palestine, but an Egyptian inscription does tell us that the Israelites were in Palestine before 1221 B.C. The Exodus from Egypt must have occurred earlier than that date.

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

THE EGYPTIAN PHARAOH MENEPTAH

Reigning 1225–1215 B.C., he was probably the Pharaoh in power at the time of the Hebrew exodus.

The Hebrew Kingdom. — After they had settled in Palestine, the Hebrews in course of time established a united kingdom with its capital at Jerusalem. In the reign of King Solomon, in the tenth century B.C., this kingdom gained considerable wealth through commerce. King Solomon, so we read, built a fleet on the Red Sea to sail to the "Land of Ophir" (ō′fẽr) for gold; he bought Egyptian horses, linen yarn, and chariots to sell to his northern neighbors; he collected tolls from spice merchants; he sent his ships as far as Spain. It was Solomon who built the famous Temple at Jerusalem, lavishing his wealth upon its decoration. Shortly after his death, however, the kingdom was broken into two parts, one of which existed for about two centuries, and the other for three, before they were conquered by the Assyrians and Babylonians, as a later page explains.

Religion of the Hebrews. — The importance of Israel, however, lay not in its transient political power and material wealth, but

in its spiritual message for mankind. While kings like Solomon built altars to many strange gods, there were prophets, great religious leaders, who arose to protest against idolatry, to warn Israel against its vices, to insist that there was only one God, Jehovah. It may be true that the ancient Hebrews often regarded Jehovah as a sort of tribal or national god. But it is also true that a loftier conception of Jehovah as the one God, supreme over all mankind, is found in certain utterances of the Hebrew prophets. In this respect the Hebrew religion was almost (though not absolutely) unique in the ancient world. For polytheism (belief in many gods), it tended to substitute monotheism (belief in one god). It was also unlike other ancient religions in its condemnation of idolatry, magic, witchcraft, and superstition. Moreover, the "Ten Commandments" and the writings of the Hebrew prophets gave the world an exalted code of morals.

Only if you have some knowledge of the human sacrifices, the vicious temple rites, the degrading superstitions and customs that were practised in ancient Mesopotamia, or in Egypt, or among the other peoples in Syria, can you realize how much the modern world owes to the Hebrew prophets whose monotheism and moral teachings entered into Christianity and Islam and through Christianity triumphed in Europe and America. One other point should be noticed. The Hebrew prophets predicted a Messiah, who would redeem Israel. Their prophecies prepared the way for the mission of Jesus,[1] and the religion of the Hebrews thus became the foundation for Christianity.

The Phœnician City-states.—Before we leave Syria, it may be well to glance at the Phœnician (fē-nĭsh′ăn) city-states that were built along the coast. Like the Hebrews, the Phœnicians were Semitic in language. In religion they were worshippers of Baal (bā′ăl) and Ashtoreth, and other pagan deities. What distinguished them, however, was their commerce and colonization. Tyre, Sidon (sī′dŏn), Byblos (bĭb′lŏs), and other Phœnician cities carried on a very extensive sea trade in the Mediterranean, while caravans took merchandise to and from Mesopotamia. The town

[1] See Chapter XIII.

of Byblos was so well known for its trade in Egyptian papyrus that its name became a synonym for book; our word "Bible" is thus a reminder of Phœnicia's commerce. Tyre gave its name to "Tyrian purple," a crimson dye extracted from a certain species of shellfish to color the robes of emperors and kings — it was the "royal purple." But dye and papyrus were but two of the innumerable wares bought and sold by Phœnician traders. We might add jewelry, pottery, olive oil, grain, the famous Lebanon cedar, linen, and many others.

The Phœnician Naval Empire. — After the fall of the Minoan naval empire and the decline of Egypt, the Phœnician cities built up very powerful navies and dominated the Mediterranean. They founded colonies on the Mediterranean coast of Africa, and in Sicily, and in Cyprus, and perhaps in Greece. Greatest of all their colonies was Carthage (kär′thăj), on the coast of what is now Tunis. The naval empire of the Phœnician cities lasted but a few centuries, from about the twelfth to the seventh, before Assyria conquered Tyre and Sidon. But during that period they did much to spread civilization. They have often been regarded as the originators of our alphabetic system of writing.

The Alphabet. — The alphabet has been of such enormous importance in making easier the task of writing and reading, and therefore of learning and of human progress, that something should be said here about its development. It was far more important, for us, than the wars of a Sargon or the wealth of a Solomon. One of the earliest forms of writing, as we know, was the carving of pictures on stone. The next step was when the pictures became simplified into symbols for words. The third great improvement was the use of some of these word-symbols to represent sounds. The Egyptians and the Sumerians and Babylonians, and perhaps the Cretans and Hittites, and the Chinese, got this far. But their writing was clumsy. The Babylonians had a symbol for each syllable, and so had to use three or four hundred symbols in ordinary writing; the Egyptians used their six hundred sound-symbols and word-symbols together in a very complicated fashion; Chinese writing takes almost a lifetime to learn. But alphabetic writing is infinitely simpler, because it has only a small number of charac-

ters, which indicate sounds. Because it represents sounds only, it is called phonetic (*phone* = sound).

Several scholars think the alphabet was invented in Egypt about 1500 B.C., in the days when Egypt had many dealings with other nations, and when Egyptian scribes were trying to write foreign languages. Another theory is that it grew out of the Minoan writing of Crete. Some claim the Phœnicians invented it. The earliest Phœnician alphabetic writing of which we know goes back to the thirteenth century B.C. By the ninth century, certainly, the Phœnicians and also the other Semitic peoples of Syria were using an alphabet of twenty-two letters. Probably through Phœnician traders[1] the Greeks learned it. Through the Greeks it has come down to us.

The Greeks even retained the names and order of the Semitic letters. The Greek name for A is *alpha*, which came from the Semitic word *aleph*, meaning an ox; probably A was originally the symbol for an ox and looked like an ox-head. The Greeks called B *beta*, because the Semites called it *beth*, meaning house. The third letter was *gimel* (camel) in Semite, and *gamma* (Γ) in Greek. D was *daleth* (door) in Semite, and *delta* (Δ) in Greek. And so on. Our word "alphabet" comes from the Greek *alpha* and *beta*, which in turn came from the Semitic words for ox and house. The Greeks were not slavish imitators. The Semites, like the Egyptians before them, had written their language in consonants only, leaving the reader to guess the vowel sounds. The Greeks, however, used some of the letters for vowels — A, E, I, O, and Y (Y was pronounced like U), and also H (corresponding to our E). Like the Semites, the Greeks used the letters of the alphabet for numerals as well as for spelling words. A stood for 1, B for 2, and so on. That is why the order of letters in the alphabet had to be kept always the same.

Empires of the Iron Age

The Iron Age. — During all the long history of early kingdoms in Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Crete, bronze had been the metal

[1] There is also a theory that the Greek alphabet was not gotten directly from the Phœnicians themselves, but from Cyprus.

from which men's tools and weapons had been made; but, as Chapter II explained, a method of melting iron ore, casting it into the desired shape, and tempering it came into use some time between 1500 and 1200 B.C. This invention had a striking effect upon the empires and kingdoms of the Near East. As iron weapons were better than weapons of bronze, nations that possessed a supply of iron were able to conquer others; iron-using empires expanded; and international wars were fought for possession of iron mines. For example, the iron mines of eastern Asia Minor, in the region now called Armenia, enabled an Armenian kingdom to become very powerful for a few centuries. More important, however, were the empires of the Hittites (hĭt′īts) and the Assyrians.

From Orbis Pictus

BRONZE STATUETTE OF A HITTITE SOLDIER

The Hittites. — The Hittites, we may explain here, had established their kingdom in the plateau of Asia Minor, with its heart in the Halys (hā′lĭs) Valley, and had pushed southward across the Taurus mountain ridge to conquer northern Syria and the western bend of the Euphrates. The Hittites used horse-drawn chariots several centuries before the Babylonians and Egyptians did; they also had iron more plentifully and earlier than their neighbors. Probably these advantages account for their career of power and glory. They had also a source of wealth in the silver mines of the Taurus (tô-rŭs) Mountains. The ruins of their capital at Boghaz Keui (bō-gäz′kû′ē), with its palaces and temples, its sculpture, and a great quantity of clay writing-tablets,

show that they were by no means barbarians; but their art was heavy and stolid, and their culture is little known. For generations they warred with the great power of Egypt, and then with the rising Assyria. Their empire was at its height from about 1400 to 1200 B.C. It was important in the rivalry of Egypt and Assyria for power, but it made so few contributions to the progress of civilization that we need not linger over its history. About the year 1200 B.C. the Hittite Empire was overthrown by a fierce barbarian people, the Phrygians (frĭj′ĭ-ănz), who had probably come from Europe, crossing the Bosphorus into Asia.

Early Assyria. — Even before the dawn of the Iron Age, Assyria (*ă*-sĭr′ĭ-*ȧ*) had become prominent. Assyria was the country that lay northwest of Babylonia in the upper valley of the Tigris — a country of rolling grainfields and hilly pasturelands, inhabited by Semitic people who spoke a language very much like that of Babylon, and wrote it in cuneiform characters on clay tablets. They worshipped the old Babylonian deities, although they gave special prominence to a local god, Ashur (ä′shōōr), whose temple was at the city of Ashur, and whose symbol, the winged disk, was carried on the king's chariot and set up in conquered cities for the vanquished to worship.

Assyrian Militarism. — While the people of Babylonia — of Akkad and Sumer — were still under Kassite rule, the Assyrians began their amazing career of war and conquest. Thanks to the Kassites, they had the horse, and their charioteers and cavalry were dreaded by enemies. Their infantry of spearmen, swordsmen, and archers fought in solid troops or phalanxes. The rank and file were common people recruited by a system of conscription, from which the rich secured exemption by sending slaves or hirelings as substitutes. Generally the campaigns had to be short, because men could not be spared from the grainfields more than a few months at a time. The generals were nobles, but the king himself acted as commander-in-chief, riding forth to war in his magnificent chariot.

Starting with a "kingdom" that embraced but a few square miles around Ashur on the Tigris, the kings of Assyria added province after province in the mountain country to the east and

north and in the prairies to the west. By the thirteenth century they were strong enough to invade the lofty Armenian plateau, far to the north, in which coveted copper mines existed. They likewise dared to lead their armies westward toward northern Syria, to try their strength against the Hittite kingdom, which was then a great power. To the southeast, they conquered Babylonia, which was still under the rule of the Kassites.

In the next two centuries, however, Assyria on the whole lost ground. Semitic tribes were pressing against her on the west and



ASSYRIAN SCULPTURE
Showing an Assyrian king on a lion-hunt.

filtering into Babylonia on the south. She lost her western possessions, and for her vital imports of metals and cloth from the west she had to pay heavily to the Semitic tribesmen who controlled the caravan routes.

The Assyrians, however, had some iron in their own mountains, and could get more from the mountains to the north. The use of iron was gradually increasing. By the tenth century it was quite common. In that same century Assyria began to revive as a military power.

Assyrian Expansion. — Beginning in the tenth century we have a long list of martial kings who called upon their subjects almost every year to drop the plough and take up the bow and quiver, the spear and the sword, for a short but strenuous cam-



Assyrian and Babylonian Empires

paign. These were no milk-and-water monarchs, but hardened warriors, who took cruelty and ruthlessness so much for granted that they felt no qualm about recording such exploits as the burning of three thousand captives alive, or the flaying alive of rebels, or the wholesale slaughter of captives, or the deportation of thousands of families from a conquered country.

It would be uninteresting to follow in detail the innumerable campaigns of Assyria's warrior-kings. Among the greatest was Shalmaneser III (shăl′mă-nē′zēr), who in the ninth century B.C. made many of the small states in Syria pay tribute to him, and conquered Cilicia (sĭ-lĭsh′ĭ-*ȧ*), north of Syria, a region from which large supplies of silver could be obtained. In the eighth century B.C. Tiglath-Pileser III (tĭg′lȧth-pĭ-lē′zēr) and Sargon II by dint of bitter fighting wrested from the Armenian mountaineers the control of the iron and copper mines in the mountain-country north of Assyria. In the seventh century Sennacherib (sĕ-năk′ēr-ĭb) crushed rebellions in Babylonia and Elam, and completed the conquest of Syria. His son, Essarhaddon, conquered Egypt, which remained under Assyrian rule from 670 to 651 B.C. Assyria was now by far the greatest empire in the Near East; it included the valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates from the Persian Gulf on the south to the towering mountains on the north; it embraced Elam and Media (mē′dĭ-*ȧ*), parts of what is now called Persia, on the east; on the west it included Cilicia, Syria, and the once mighty empire of Egypt.

Imperial Government. — In governing this vast empire the Assyrians were more successful than the Egyptians and Babylonians before them had been in controlling smaller empires. At the head of the government was the king or emperor, a supreme and absolute ruler, chief leader in war, and representative of the god Ashur. Under the king were governors who administered the districts into which Assyria was divided. Conquered lands were at first left under their own kings, and merely compelled to pay tribute; but later the Assyrians learned that it was safer to convert such lands into provinces ruled by Assyrian governors. Rebellions were put down with ferocious cruelty. Another method of preventing rebellion was to take many inhabitants of the con-

quered land away from their homes and deport them to other parts of the Empire. The Assyrians were the first to appreciate the importance of good roads in holding an empire together; they built a number of highways over which royal messengers and armies could be sent, and along these roads they organized something like a post-office system for the rapid handling of government messages.

Economic Life. — War and conquest greatly changed the economic life of Assyria. At the outset Assyria was a farming country with little commerce or manufacturing, but the farmers were conscripted to serve in the army, and in time there were few free farmers left. Assyria became a land of large estates, owned by nobles and cultivated by slaves or by non-free farmers who were bought and sold with the land. Manufacturing and trade were allowed to fall into the hands of foreigners. The government depended for its revenues more upon tribute from conquered provinces and plunder from victorious wars th[illegible] development of agriculture and business.

Culture. — Throughout her career, Assyria [illegible]ema[illegible] to ancient Babylonia for much of her religion, for her [illegible] cuneiform writing on clay tablets, and in general for the [illegible] features of her civilization. Assyria's chief importance was as an empire which received civilization from others and passed it on.

The Assyrians, however, were not entirely imitators of Babylon. In sculpture, for example, the Assyrians did some very fine work toward the end of the empire. In their architecture they were able to use more stone than the Babylonians had used, for stone was scarce in Babylonia. From the Hittites the Assyrians borrowed the idea of using stone colonnades or rows of pillars, and of placing massive winged bulls before the portals of their palaces. In building royal palaces each Assyrian king tried to outdo his forerunner. Sennacherib, one of the greatest kings, rebuilt the ancient city of Nineveh for his capital and erected there his palace, with five pairs of colossal bulls at the entrance, with sculptured walls showing his mighty victories, and with splendid pillars covered with bands of shining silver and copper to reflect the light from skylights into the windowless rooms.

Ashurbanipal, a Royal Scholar. — Ashurbanipal (ä′shŏŏr-bä′nĕ-päl′, 669–626 B.C.), the last great king of Assyria, inherited an empire including all Mesopotamia, Palestine and Syria, and Egypt — the most civilized part of the world of that age. The empire had reached its climax.

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

RELIEF FROM PALACE OF ASHURBANIPAL AT NINEVEH

Ashurbanipal's reign was a period of great literary activity. He took an intense interest in collecting a great library, which he housed in his father's palace. The precious clay tablets containing old records [illegible] were [illegible] A [illegible] compilers, copy- [illegible] and librarians [illegible] have been kept busy by the enthusiastic ruler. The king himself learned to read the dead language of the ancient Sumerians, with the aid of a dictionary. If the history, religion, and literature of ancient Mesopotamia were preserved, it was in no small part due to Ashurbanipal.

The Fate of Nineveh. — The reign of Ashurbanipal was followed by ruinous civil wars among rival pretenders to the throne. Only a few years elapsed before Babylonian rebels, joining forces with barbarians (the Medes from the east and the Scythians from the north) captured the proud city of Nineveh (612 B.C.). The statue of Ishtar, the Assyrian goddess of victory, was dragged from her temple and cast headless into the dust, a mute witness that

victory was dead for the Assyrians. A Babylonian scribe briefly records the fate of the city: "They carried off the booty of the city, a quantity beyond reckoning, and they turned the city into ruined mounds." The country round about was pillaged and laid waste. Many of the nobles must have perished by the sword; numbers of the common people were taken captive by the Persians; the Assyrian nation was almost wiped out.

Babylon Again Supreme. — The Babylonians, who had long regarded Assyria as an upstart, now had their hour of vengeance and of triumph. The Babylonian general who conducted the siege of Nineveh was now monarch of Mesopotamia, and Mesopotamia was once more a Babylonian Empire. Rich gifts were offered to the gods of Babylon. The Babylonians had learned from their former Assyrian masters the military skill that had made Nineveh great. That is why the restored Babylonian Empire was able to continue, for a short time, the Assyrian traditions of militarism and conquest.

Nebuchadrezzar and the Hebrews. — Nebuchadrezzar (něb′ū-kăd-rĕz′ȧr), who ruled from 605 to 562 B.C., launched Babylon



Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

SOLDIERS ATTACKING A FORTRESS

The fortress, in the center, is defended by the archers who stand on its battlements. Some of the attacking troops, armed with battle-axes and shields, are approaching the fort, while their archers shower arrows on the defenders. From a painting in the tomb of an Egyptian Pharaoh, about 1940 B.C.

on a career of aggressive wars. The upper Euphrates Valley, and Syria, and Palestine yielded to his sword. He invaded Egypt. His dealings with the Hebrews were typical of the cruelty meted out to conquered peoples. When they rebelled he carried off the

princes, craftsmen, and soldiers to Babylon as captives. When they rebelled a second time, he burned Jerusalem, and ordered the Hebrew king's sons to be slain before his eyes, and then had the king's eyes put out. The blind king and thousands of his subjects were taken captives to Babylon. It was at Babylon that the prophet Daniel was cast into the den of lions. It was at Babylon that Nebuchadrezzar built his splendid palace, and had the famous hanging gardens made for his Persian queen. It was Nebuchadrezzar who bade the Jews worship a golden image, as we read in the Old Testament. This period during which many Jews were captives in Babylonia is known in Jewish history as the "Babylonian Captivity."

The Fall of Babylon. — Babylon did not last long after Nebuchadrezzar's death. His son was murdered by a brother-in-law. Then the Babylonian priests put the son of a priestess on the throne, a scholarly gentleman little inclined to war. And in the year 539 B.C. Babylon was conquered by Persia.

The Rise of Persia

The Iranian Plateau. — The hot, flat coastland along the shores of the Persian Gulf and the hill-country nearby were closely connected in civilization and history with the ancient Sumerians and Babylonians. This was the land known as Elam, to which we have more than once referred. North of Elam, however, rises a vast plateau stretching from Mesopotamia on the west to the Indus Valley on the east. Much of it lies from three to five thousand feet above sea-level, and here and there it rises into lofty mountains, or sinks into river valleys. To-day much of the land receives very little rain, and large areas are desert. In ancient times, however, the rainfall was more generous, and regions now barren were good pasture lands.

In very early times these highlands were invaded by tribes of shepherds and herdsmen, who called themselves Iranians (ī-rā′nĭ-ănz), but who became known in later history by various other names. Those who lived in the northwestern part of the plateau were called Medes (mēdz), and their homeland was termed Media.

Another group, who lived in the southern part, were known as Persians.

Media and Assyria. — The Medes frequently suffered defeat at the hands of the great military empire of Assyria, until in the seventh century B.C. Assyrian military methods were copied by a very remarkable Median king, Cyaxares (sī-ăks′*ȧ*-rēz). His cavalry was even more effective than that of Assyria, for the Iranians were expert horsemen and could circle swiftly about an enemy, discharging their arrows with deadly aim. With his improved army, Cyaxares invaded Assyria and joined with the Babylonians and Scythians in destroying Nineveh. As his share of the spoils of the fallen Empire he not only carried off rich booty, and numerous Assyrian craftsmen (who probably did much to raise the level of industrial skill in Persia), but he also acquired the mountainous territory of Armenia, with its metal mines. His empire included, besides other regions, all of eastern Asia Minor as far as the Halys River.

Persian Empire Founded by Cyrus. — About half a century later, the Kingdom of Media was conquered by Cyrus (sī′*rŭ*s) the Great (558–529 B.C.), the king of the Persians, who had united the southern part of the Iranian plateau and now marched north to seize Media. Henceforth we shall extend the term Persians to include the Medes, and Persia to include Media. Under Cyrus, Persia embraced not merely the country now known by that name on modern maps, but also a number of extensive subject provinces. With brilliant generalship and limitless ambition, Cyrus embarked on a career of conquest. He conquered all of Asia Minor, as we shall explain in Chapter VI. It was Cyrus, also, who conquered Babylon in the year 539 B.C. and thus became master of Mesopotamia and Syria.

Persia the Heir of Babylon and Assyria. — Here we may pause in the story, leaving the later career of Persia to Chapter VI. One thing, however, must be emphasized here, namely, the fact that the vigorous young empire of the Persians was in reality a continuation of the older Babylonian and Assyrian civilizations, under a new ruling class of military leaders. From ancient Mesopotamia Persia inherited the system of cuneiform writing, the

Assyrian style of architecture, the Assyrian method of organizing the army, the Assyrian method of governing an empire, and, in short, a great many of the features of Babylonian and Assyrian civilization.

Persian Religion. — In religion, however, the Persians had something new and different to contribute. Some time before the reign of Cyrus, a religious reformer had arisen whose Iranian name, Zarathustra (zä′rȧ-thōōs′trȧ) is better known in its Greek form as Zoroaster (zō′rŏ-ăs′tĕr). While he was yet a young man, Zoroaster had seven miraculous visions, so it was believed, in which he had conversations with the god Ahura Mazda (ä′hŏŏ-rȧ mȧz′dȧ) and six archangels. What they revealed to him was written down in letters of gold on the hides of oxen. We do not possess the original copy, but these revelations were handed down from one generation to another, along with various hymns and psalms and other religious compositions. These sacred writings, known as the *Avesta* (ȧ-vĕs′tȧ), might be called the Bible of the ancient Persians. It is difficult to know which parts of the Avesta were the work of Zoroaster, and which were composed by his followers. The one supreme god, he said, is Ahura Mazda, the Wise Lord, creator of man and of all good things, righteous and just. He is the god of light and life. But there is also evil in the world, and that is the work of Ahriman (ä′rĭ-mȧn), the Evil Spirit, who created the serpent, the flies, the insects, and all things evil. Ahriman is the spirit of darkness, dirt, and death. Between Ahura Mazda and Ahriman is waged a ceaseless war. In the end Ahura Mazda will triumph. By evil deeds man aids Ahriman; by righteousness one serves Ahura Mazda. After death each man's immortal soul will be judged, and if the good deeds outweigh his sins he will pass into Paradise; otherwise, he is surrendered to Ahriman.

At first Zoroaster found few converts to his remarkable ideas. Only after much discouragement did he at length succeed in converting a certain king in eastern Persia. After that, the religion spread rapidly, and though Zoroaster himself may have been killed in one of the wars fought for the new religion, nevertheless Zoroastrianism became the creed of Persia.

TIME CHART NO. 4. FROM 1000 TO 500 B.C.

	Western Mediterranean	Greek City-States	Egypt and Western Asia	Separated Civilizations
1000 B.C. 10th Century 900 B.C.	Prehistoric Iron Age in Western and Central Europe. Italian tribes in Italy. Etruscans settle in Italy.	Greece in Iron Age, emerging from period of obscurity after Dorian Invasions and Ionian Migration. New city-states arising.	Egypt weak and disunited. Phœnician maritime expansion. Solomon King in Palestine. Assyrian Empire in eclipse.	Maya culture developing in Central America Aryan or Hindu civilization developing in India. Numerous principalities and tribal republics.
9th Century 800 B.C.	Greek colony of Cumæ founded in Italy before 800. Carthage founded (822?)	Homer's "Iliad" and "Odyssey" composed.	Assyrian Empire using iron and expanding. Shalmaneser invades Syria and takes tribute from Phœnicia.	
8th Century 700 B.C.	Greek colonization in Italy and Sicily. Syracuse (734). Sybaris (720).	Greek colonial expansion. Spartan conquest of Messenia. Attica united as city-state of Athens. Corinth becoming prominent commercial state.	Assyrian Empire very powerful; wars with Armenia; invasions of Syria and Palestine.	Feudal Age in China under weak Chóu dynasty. Conflicts with Central Asian barbarians.
7th Century 600 B.C.	Considerable Greek and Phœnician commerce in Western Mediterranean.	Helot Revolt against Sparta. Corinth under "tyrants." Miletus flourishing. Athens in transition to republic. Draco's Laws (621). Coinage spreading and commerce growing.	Assyrian Empire at height, dominant in Western Asia. Conquest of Egypt (670–651). Egypt ousts Assyrians (651) and regains prosperity under Greek influence. Greek traders in Delta. Greek troops in Egyptian army. Collapse of Assyria and fall of Nineveh (612).	Iron Age beginning in Far East.
6th Century 500 B.C.	Carthage becoming a powerful commercial empire. Pythagoras in Italy. Etruscan influence over little city-state of Rome. Rome becomes a republic (508?).	Sparta a militaristic aristocracy, head of Peloponnesian League. Athens becoming a democracy. Solon's reforms (594); tyranny (546–510); Cleisthenes' reforms (508). Culture flourishing in Ionia: Sappho, Thales. Ionia conquered by Lydia, then by Persia.	Revival of Babylonian Empire. Lydia prosperous under Crœsus (560–546). Zoroastrianism in Persia. Persian Empire founded by Cyrus (558–529). Persian conquest of Lydia (546), Babylon (539), and Egypt (525). Darius (521–485), Persian Emperor, supreme in Western Asia.	Northwest India a Persian satrapy. Gautama Buddha. Confucius.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Why were Egypt and Mesopotamia specially favorable regions for the development of agriculture, government, and civilization?
2. Compare and contrast ancient Egyptian and Babylonian civilizations as regards irrigation, writing, government, social classes, architecture, and contributions to civilization.
3. How did the alphabet originate? What advantages does alphabetic writing have over other forms of writing?
4. If you compared a list of the chief ancient Egyptian buildings and the chief modern buildings (let us say, in an American city), what striking differences would be revealed as regards business, government, and religion?
5. Contrast the life of a feudal noble in ancient Egypt and the life of an American business man.
6. What were the effects of the Hyksos invasion on Egypt? Compare them with the effects of the Kassite conquest of Mesopotamia.
7. What regions were conquered by the Egyptian emperors of the XVIIIth Dynasty? How important were these conquests?
8. Can you give any reasons for the decline of Egyptian power?
9. What did ancient Egypt contribute to the progress of civilization?
10. Describe Sumerian civilization.
11. What does Hammurabi's code tell us about Babylonian social classes and customs? Compare Hammurabi's laws with modern laws.
12. Explain what is meant by Minoan Civilization.
13. Who were the Semites? The Hittites? The Phœnicians?
14. What religious ideas of the ancient Hebrews have affected modern European and American civilization?
15. Describe the aims and methods of ancient warfare as illustrated by Egyptian, Babylonian, and Assyrian history.
16. What was the importance of the fall of Nineveh? Of Babylon?

SPECIAL TOPICS

The dawn of history in Egypt. Breasted, *History of Egypt*, 25–50; Myres, *Dawn of History*, 45–66; Cambridge Ancient History, I, ch. vi.

Sumerian civilization. Myres, *Dawn of History*, 84–104; Cambridge Ancient History, I, ch. x.

Egyptian commerce. Baikie, *The Amarna Age*, 110–117.

The Hittites. Baikie, *The Amarna Age*, ch. v; Myres, *Dawn of History*, 147–162; and for reference, Cambridge Ancient History, II, ch. xi, and III, ch. vii.

The alphabet. Kroeber, *Anthropology*, ch. xi; W. A. Mason, *History of the Art of Writing*.

Babylonian astrology and astronomy. KROEBER, *Anthropology*, 253–254; CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY, III, 237–240.

Minoan civilization. BOTSFORD, *Hellenic History*, 8–29; BAIKIE, *Sea-Kings of Crete*, 211–231; BURY, *History of Greece*, 7–20; CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY, I, 589–599 II, 431–446; ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA, new vols., I, 175–178; GLOTZ, *Ægean Civilization*.

Laws of Hammurabi. JASTROW, *Civilization of Babylonia and Assyria*, ch. vi; BOTSFORD, *Source-Book of Ancient History*, 29–31; CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY, I, 508–528.

Economic life in ancient Egypt. KNIGHT, *Economic History of Europe*, I, 18–26.

The Phœnician cities. KNIGHT, *Economic History of Europe*, I, 28–30; BOTSFORD, *Source-Book of Ancient History*, 42–47.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THE TEACHER

PEAKE and FLEURE, *Priests and Kings*. CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY, I–III. J. H. BREASTED, *History of Egypt*. A. MORET, *The Nile and Egyptian Civilization*. A. E. WEIGALL, *History of the Pharaohs*. SIR ARTHUR EVANS, *Palace of Minos*. G. GLOTZ, *Ægean Civilization*. L. W. KING, *History of Babylon*. E. A. W. BUDGE, *Babylonian Life and History*. H. R. HALL, *Ancient History of the Near East*. JASTROW, *Civilization of Babylonia and Assyria*. A. T. E. OLMSTEAD, *History of Assyria*. D. G. HOGARTH, *Ancient East*. L. DELAPORTE, *Mesopotamia*. G. GARSTANG, *The Land of the Hittites*. H. H. VON DER OSTEN, *Explorations in Hittite Asia Minor*, 1–9. W. L. WESTERMANN, *Story of the Ancient Nations*. G. W. BOTSFORD, *History of the Ancient World*. J. T. SHOTWELL, *Introduction to the History of History*, chs. ii, v, vi, xi. ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA, new vols., I, "Archæology," 171–183.

CONVENIENT SOURCE MATERIALS

G. W. BOTSFORD, *Source-Book of Ancient History*, 1–54. W. S. DAVIS, *Readings in Ancient History*, I. J. H. BREASTED, *Ancient Records of Egypt* (5 vols.). R. F. HARPER, *The Code of Hammurabi*. L. W. KING, *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*. THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Fertile lands
Mountain barriers
Desert barriers
WOODED COUNTRY
Lake Baikal
YEZO
Plateau of Mongolia
The grasslands or steppes inhabited by barbaric nomads
Altai Mts.
Gobi Desert
Northern "Barbarians"
SEA OF JAPAN
KOREA
JAPAN
Black Sea
Caspian Sea
L. Balkash
Aral Sea
Tian Shan Mts.
Yellow R.
OLD CHINA
Yellow Sea
SHENSI
Lo
Singan Fu
Mediterranean Sea
Syrian Desert
Hindu Kush Mts.
Plateau of Tibet
Plateau of Iran
Yangtse R.
Southern "Barbarians"
EAST CHINA SEA
Persian Gulf
RED SEA
Arabian Desert
Ganges R.
INDIA
ARABIAN SEA
BAY OF BENGAL
Gulf of Aden
Gulf of Siam
SOUTH CHINA SEA
Sulu Sea
Celebes Sea
PACIFIC OCEAN
INDIAN OCEAN

ASIA

CHAPTER IV

SEPARATED CIVILIZATIONS IN ASIA AND AMERICA

Central and Separated Civilizations. — We now must scan a broader horizon. The oldest civilizations of which we have any sure knowledge grew up in the cluster of lands that lie at the very center of the Old World, in between the three continents of Asia, Africa, and Europe. They were, geographically, the central civilizations; and in history as well as geography they occupy a central place. From them we can most directly trace our own civilization. But only narrow prejudice or ignorance could blind us to the fact that there were other civilizations, too, in widely separated lands. And from these separated civilizations we have also received much to enrich modern life. To China, for example, we owe china, and tea, and silk, and gunpowder, perhaps the compass, perhaps paper and printing, and many things less easy to list so definitely. India and America likewise had their contributions to make.

The Far Eastern World

The Great Barrier. — For thousands of years the eastern part of Asia was practically a world in itself, shut off from Europe and the Mediterranean civilization by a chain of mountain ranges and deserts. You can trace this barrier on the map — the semi-desert plateau and mountains of Iran (Persia); the Hindu-Kush, Himalaya, and Tian Shan mountain masses; the Altai range, and the lesser ridges which reach into Manchuria and eastern Siberia.

The Highland Herdsmen of Mongolia. — East of the main barrier lie two elevated basins, the barren plateaus of Tibet and Mongolia. Much of Mongolia is actually desert — the Desert of

Gobi. Other parts of the Mongolian plateau afford grazing lands for a sparse population. Some have thought that the plateau country may have been the oldest, or one of the oldest homes of mankind. Perhaps so. What we do know is that the herdsmen of the highlands, who in normal times migrate back and forth from summer pastures to winter pastures, feel at times the pressure of drought or of overpopulation. Then they must migrate in search of new grazing lands and new homes. Like the Arabian-Syrian desert, Mongolia has sent out wave after wave of nomad herdsmen and warriors to conquer the wealthier but less hardy plainsfolk. European history contains the record of invading barbarians from Mongolia, who at one time conquered a large part of eastern Europe.[1] More often, the plateau dwellers chose the easier exits to the east, and descended down the river valleys into China. Chinese history from the earliest times portrays the age-long conflict between the civilized farmers of the low country and the aggressive invaders from the plateau. It was against the Mongols that the Chinese built their Great Wall.[2]

Trade across the Barrier. — But the Mongol nomads of the Central Asian highlands were not merely barbarians to be dreaded by civilized nations. They also performed a very useful function. They carried on a certain amount of trade between the Far Eastern World and the Near East. Thus gems and other articles crossed the passes of the mountain barrier. Thus, the use of bronze and iron[3] and the Egyptian art of glazing pottery may have been carried to China. Thus Chinese inventions, in later ages, were carried to Europe. That is the way in which some historians explain some of the similarities between Chinese and Western civilizations.

Theories of Chinese Origins. — Another explanation which has been strongly urged in recent years is extremely interesting, though by no means finally proved. The theory is that mining prospectors from the Near Eastern world, perhaps from the region

[1] See pp. 454–458, 660–664. [2] See pp. 394, 395.

[3] The Chinese were using iron for agricultural implements by the seventh century B.C., and for swords by the year 500 B.C. In the use of iron, therefore, they were several centuries behind the peoples of the eastern Mediterranean.

of Mesopotamia and Elam, searched far and wide in quest of copper, tin, gold, and precious stones such as lapis lazuli and turquoise. Some of them discovered gold and copper and jade in the mountains of northern China, in the upper valley of the Yellow River, and settled there in what is now the Chinese province of Shensi (shĕn′sē′). Thus the pottery, metal-working, irrigation, and other inventions of the Egypto-Mesopotamian world were introduced into China.

Attempts have been made, likewise, to identify some of the ideograms (characters standing for words) in the Chinese system of writing with ideograms in the ancient Sumerian[1] writing. Some of them are remarkably similar. The fact that the Sumerians had obliquely set eyes, like the Chinese, can also be used as an argument in favor of the theory that the Chinese were at least distant relatives of the early people who built up the most ancient civilization in the region north of the Persian Gulf.

Another Theory. — Another way of interpreting the same facts is to imagine that both the Chinese and the Sumerians migrated from an earlier homeland somewhere in Central Asia, say the great plateau of Turkestan. Possibly the gradual drying up of this region might account for such emigration. Here again, however, we are dealing with theories rather than with proved historical facts.

The Chinese Theory. — Chinese historians have a very different story to tell of their origins, and it may be as correct as these that have been mentioned. Ancient Chinese histories tell of no migration from the distant West, nor do they thank the West for the germs of Chinese civilization. They begin with the Chinese in northwestern China, in the upper valley of the Yellow River, the cradle of Chinese civilization.

The Legendary History of China. — The earlier chapters of Chinese history, as told by the Chinese, are undoubtedly tinged with myth, if not wholly fiction. In the beginning, we read, lived P'an-ku (pän-kōō′), the first man, millions of years ago. He was the first ruler of the world. Then followed the reigns of thirteen brothers, the "Heavenly Emperors," each of whom ruled for

[1] See above, p. 53.

eighteen thousand years. That was the age of innocence, when all men were wise and good. Then followed the eleven "Terrestrial Emperors," brothers all, who established the calendar, with thirty days to a month, and divided day from night. Their successors were nine brothers, the "Human Emperors," who divided the world into nine kingdoms. And so the story goes on, through dynasty after dynasty.

One of these legendary rulers discovered fire by gazing at the stars, and invented the method of producing fire by rubbing sticks together. He too invented the method of writing by means of knots tied in a string. Another great benefactor taught men how to hunt and fish, and raise cattle, and write in hieroglyphics, and play musical instruments. Before that, men had lived like animals, eating raw meat and clothing themselves in skins. The same ruler organized families, with the father at the head of each family. A later Emperor invented the plough and other agricultural implements and discovered the medicinal use of plants. A still later monarch built the first temple and the first palace, and invented the bow and arrow, and harnessed oxen to carts, and introduced the use of money.

An Interpretation of the Legends. — The Chinese accounts of these legendary Emperors may perhaps be interpreted as fanciful explanations of the development of the Chinese people from the Old Stone Age to Neolithic civilization. The dates assigned to the inventive Emperors range from about 2850 B.C. to 2500 B.C. Perhaps that may not be very far from an accurate estimate of the period at which the Chinese laid the foundations of their civilization. They were certainly still in the Stone Age at that time. Copper, it is supposed, was not used much in China until a relatively late date, say the fourteenth or thirteenth century B.C.

Good and Evil Emperors. — We need not repeat in detail what the Chinese historians say about the long list of Emperors that followed the inventors. Some of these rulers were held up as models of wisdom and virtue; others were censured as shameful illustrations of cruelty and vice.

China under the Chóu Dynasty. — Chinese history becomes more credible when we reach the period of the Chóu (chou) dynasty

(1122–249 B.C.). For this period bronze vessels, and inscriptions, and records of eclipses, give a little substantial evidence in addition to the chronicles written by Chinese historians. In the twelfth century B.C. civilized China was still little more than a part of the fertile plain through which flows the Yellow River. The Empire was still small, as compared with modern China. Manchuria, Mongolia, and Tibet had not yet been conquered. The lands south of the Yangtse River were held by barbarians, although China had gained control of part of that valley. China was in truth the "Middle Kingdom" (as the Chinese themselves called their land), for it was hemmed in on the north and the south, as well as on the west, by barbarians of whom we know very little except that they were a constant menace to China. The capital was not at Peking but near Singan Fu (sē-n'gän-fōō'), on the Yellow River.

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

A CHINESE WINE-HOLDER OF BRONZE

Part of a set of sacrificial vessels. Made in the period of the Chóu Dynasty.

Border Duchies and Barbarians. — On the border of the kingdom were vassal states or duchies, ruled by princes or dukes who recognized the Chinese Emperor as their sovereign, in theory at least. It was the task of these border duchies to carry on incessant warfare against the barbarians outside the empire, and to check invasions by Mongols or Huns. When the beacons were lit on the hilltops, as a sign that the barbarians were coming, the border dukes as a rule were the leaders who sallied out, with their chariots, to face the enemy.

As time passed, the dukes and other rulers of provinces became more and more independent. The Emperor, to be sure, was still supreme, as far as dignity and honor were concerned; he alone bore the exalted title "Son of Heaven"; he alone could offer sacrifices to Heaven in the name of the nation, and to his imperial ancestors. The Emperors, however, were often lacking in warlike spirit, while the rulers of border duchies were hardened to bloodshed, and proud of their strength. By the sixth century B.C., the Chinese Empire had become a group of almost independent duchies, loosely held together under the weak authority of the Emperor. And the leading duchies were often at war amongst themselves, striving for supremacy.

Chinese Writing. — The Chinese had developed a system of writing which may be compared with the ancient Egyptian hieroglyphic inscriptions, or with the Babylonian cuneiform, although it was different from either. It consisted in the first place of pictograms, that is, pictures which had become simplified into symbols for things. Secondly, it contained ideograms, or combinations of pictograms representing ideas. Thus the sun drawn above the horizon would mean dawn, or the pictograms for sun and moon combined might mean light, or bright. Thirdly, there were phonograms, or symbols representing sounds. Each character, however, represented a whole word; and most words were of one syllable. The characters were written in columns, from top to bottom, and the columns were read from right to left. Now this system of writing was and still is a tremendous handicap to China. It is a handicap, because the characters are so difficult to make and so numerous. To learn writing and reading in Chinese is no easy task. Had China had much commerce with Syria or with other western countries in the time of the Chóu dynasty, perhaps the Chinese might have borrowed the alphabet, as did the neighbors of Syria. But China remained ignorant of the alphabet until a vast amount of Chinese literature had been written, and by that time the Chinese were reluctant to abandon their time-honored system.

China and Korea. — Just a few words should be added about other Far Eastern lands in ancient times. As for Korea, there are

legends which tell how the land was formerly inhabited by savages, dwelling in caves, until a Chinese invasion occurred. The leader of the invasion became ruler of the country, and introduced Chinese civilization. Ancient Chinese histories occasionally mention Korea as a vassal state of China. It is not at all unlikely that civilization was introduced into Korea from China.

Early Japan. — The islands of Japan were not so easily reached by Chinese culture, for the ancient Chinese were not seafaring folk. Japanese legends tell of invasions of the islands, but do not tell us who the invaders were. It is generally supposed that the islands were subject to a number of invasions, by Malays (the people that now inhabit the East Indies and Philippines), by Mongols or Manchus, by Koreans, perhaps also by Chinese. These invaders seem to have conquered and almost annihilated the hairy cave-dwellers, the Ainus (ī′nōōz), whom they found inhabiting the islands. To-day only a few thousand Ainus remain, in the northern island of Yezo.

Japanese Legends. — According to Japanese legends, the first emperor was Jimmu Tenno (660 B.C.), and many and marvelous were the deeds of the early rulers. The Japanese people, as they appear in the legends, seem to have been far from uncivilized. They lived in houses, they wove rather elaborate garments for themselves, they used iron for their swords and arrowheads, they grew rice, which they ate with chopsticks, and they were skillful hunters and fishermen as well as farmers. It is not a very vivid picture that we can draw of them from our scanty information. Not until several centuries after the beginning of the Christian era is there any Japanese history that can be regarded as authentic. And then we shall find the Japanese, like the Koreans, learning much from China.

The Aryans in India

India's Isolation. — The triangular peninsula of India, jutting southward from Central Asia, is almost a continent in itself. On the north it is almost completely cut off from Asia by a double wall of snow-crowned mountains, the loftiest in the world, the

Himalayas. Mountains and deserts on the northwest bar the road to Persia; while mountains and forests on the east interpose a barrier between India and Indo-China. To the south, there is the Indian Ocean, not easily crossed when civilization was still in its infancy.

Contacts with the West. — To be sure, even in ancient times there was a little sea-borne trade by coasting vessels plying between India and Mesopotamia. And the mountains on the north were not an absolute barrier. Ancient India received the Phœnician alphabet through Mesopotamia, and iron was probably first brought in from the West. Invaders, too, occasionally made their way through the mountain passes, to descend upon the fertile Indian plains. Small quantities of Indian cotton, ivory, tin, rice, and spices were carried to Babylonia and Egypt in very early times. India was not wholly isolated. Yet the barriers, though not impenetrable, were such an obstacle to intercourse with other countries that India was certainly not in the main stream of progress and of history. That is perhaps the chief reason why Indian civilization became so different from the civilization of the Mediterranean lands.

Recent Excavations. — Recent excavations among buried ruins in India have furnished some evidence that an agricultural civilization like that of the predynastic Egyptians and of the earliest Sumerians grew up in India also, or was introduced into India at a very early date. The facts so far discovered, however, are so scanty that for the present we must rely chiefly upon recorded history.

The *Rig Veda*. — The recorded history of India begins with the *Rig Veda* (rĭg-vā′dȧ) ("sacred knowledge of praise"), which is a collection of a thousand ancient hymns. These were memorized by priests and handed down orally from one generation to another, for how long we do not know, before they were finally put into writing. If the oldest parts of the *Rig Veda* were composed about 1200 B.C., as is asserted by writers who know them well, then our history of India must begin after the Egyptian Empire had already grown hoary and feeble with age; the King of Crete had fallen and his palace had been burned; Babylonia had already fallen under

Kassite rule, while Assyria was arising as a military Empire; and the Achæans[1] were besieging Troy.

Sanskrit and Other Indo-European Languages. — The language of the *Rig Veda* was Sanskrit (săn′skrĭt). It is strikingly similar to ancient Greek, Latin, and Persian. For instance, the Sanskrit word for "man" or "warrior" was *vira*, the ancient Persian word was the same, the Latin word was *vir*, the Greek was *heros* (ἥρως), the Anglo-Saxon, *wer*. Our words *virtue* (vir-tue, or manliness), and *virile* (vir-ile, or manly) come from the same source. Similarly, the word for foot was *pada* in Sanskrit, *pous* (ποῦς) in Greek, *pes* in Latin — whence comes the modern French, *pied*, and our words *pedal* and *pedestrian*. A slightly different form of the same word, substituting *f* for *p*, became *fot* in Anglo-Saxon, *foot* in English, and *Fuss* in German. Dozens of other words can be traced through this family of languages in the same fashion. More than that, all these languages are based on certain grammatical principles which mark them off from other languages. Because they are so similar, Sanskrit, ancient Persian, Greek, Latin, Gothic, Celtic, and the modern Teutonic, Romance, and Slavic languages of Europe are often called "Indo-European" languages.

Language and Racial Migrations. — Now we know well enough that people speaking kindred languages, or even the same language, are not necessarily close relatives by blood or race. In this country English is spoken by Negroes, Chinese, Slavs, and Italians, as well as by descendants of English colonists. Nevertheless, the fact that English is spoken in America is the result of the migration of English-speaking people to America. If we know that Portuguese is spoken in both Brazil and Portugal, we may guess that Portuguese people settled in Brazil, or vice versa.

The Aryan Theory. — In the same way we are tempted to guess that there was long ago some group of tribes or peoples who migrated from their original homeland, carrying their language — different in dialects but fundamentally the same — into India, Persia, Greece, Italy, and most of the countries of Europe. Historians and philologists (students of languages) who believe this guess to be correct usually go farther. They call the original

[1] See pp. 127–132, below.

language Indo-European (because it spread over India and Europe) or *Aryan* (är′yăn) (a Sanskrit word meaning a man of good or noble family). They even try to imagine what sort of people the original "Aryans" or Aryan-speakers were, and whence they came. Whether the original home of the Aryans was in the Danube Valley, or in Russia, or elsewhere, is not known.

Aryan Migrations. — From this original homeland, it is thought, the Aryans overflowed in successive waves. Some of them pushed into Italy and Greece, where their language became Latin and Greek respectively; some became the Celts of western Europe; others, in the north, became the Germans and Scandinavians; others became the ancestors of the Slavs, in eastern Europe; still others passed down through the Balkans, across the Straits into Asia Minor, and on into Persia and India. Some of the Hittite inscriptions at Boghaz Keui, in Asia Minor, seem to show that there were in Asia Minor, as early as 1400 B.C., people who were Aryans or had been influenced by Aryans. All this, let it be repeated, is based on elaborate guesswork, rather than on any sure proof or written records.

Aryans and Dravidians. — The *Rig Veda* gives us interesting glimpses of the Aryan tribesmen who had crossed the mountains of Afghanistan and descended into India. Here we find them at war with dark-skinned natives who were described as being "noseless." The natives were probably ancestors of the short, black-skinned, curly-headed, flat-nosed people that are found in southern India today, and are called Dravidians (drȧ-vĭd′ĭ-ăns). There can be little doubt that the Dravidians formerly occupied northern India. But they were no match for the hardy, warlike white men, the Aryans, who invaded their land from the northwest. Into one fertile valley after another the Aryans entered as conquerors, and the dusky natives were either killed, or enslaved, or driven southward.

Social Customs. — The Aryans who settled in the northwestern river valleys were a race of herdsmen. The value of a man's life, or of a slave, or of a gold necklace was measured in terms of so many cows. Cattle provided the leather, and sheep the wool, for clothing. Cows furnished both milk and meat. But the Aryans

also tilled the soil with ploughs drawn by bulls, and sowed grain which they reaped with sickles. The life of these herdsmen and farmers, in their little villages, must have been simple and lacking in both luxury and refinement, but not without excitement. The Aryans were fond of chariot-racing, and of gambling with dice; they danced; they drank their intoxicating *soma;* they played the flute, the lute, and the drum; occasionally they had guests, and a generous host would butcher a large ox so that there might be good cheer in plenty.

War. — Above all, there was the excitement of war. Their many wars were fought to conquer new territory from the dark Dravidians. Frequently tribes went on the warpath to seize their neighbors' cattle. Ambitious chieftains waged wars to extend their power. Chiefs and nobles went forth to battle riding in their chariots, and clad in helmet and coat of mail, while commoners fought on foot, with bow and arrows, spears and swords, and slings. With the king rode a priest, to say prayers and mutter magic incantations for victory.

Aryans and Greeks. — Much of this description reminds us of the Greeks who fought the Trojan War, at about the same period.[1] And there are other points of similarity. The gods of the Aryans and of the ancient Greeks had a close family resemblance. Indra (ĭn′drȧ), the patron god of the Aryans, wielder of the thunderbolt, at once suggests the Greek Zeus, who also hurled thunderbolts. Like the Greeks, the Aryans regarded the sun, the moon, the stars, the wind, the dawn, as gods, and imagined those gods in human form. To the gods they offered milk, grain, meat, and wine, hoping to win divine blessings and aid.

The Aryans of the *Rig Veda* and the Homeric Greeks may have been much the same sort of people, but they developed along very different lines, as time went on. The Greeks had contact with the civilization of Egypt, Phœnicia, and Assyria; borrowing much from older nations, they built up the brilliant culture of Athens. The Aryans of India, on the other hand, were for centuries almost entirely cut off from the rest of the world, and their progress was less rapid.

[1] See below, pp. 127–132.

Caste. — Even in this early period an elaborate caste system was developing in India. A caste is an hereditary social class. There were hereditary social classes in ancient Egypt, in Assyria, in Greece, and in many other countries, ancient or modern; but in India class distinctions became more complicated and more rigid than elsewhere. In the *Rig Veda* age, there were four chief classes — (1) *Brahmans* (brä′măns) or priests; (2) *Kshatriyas* (kshăt′rē-yȧs) or nobles; (3) *Vaisyas* (vī′syȧs) or farmers and commoners; (4) *Sudras* (sōō′drȧs) or serfs. The three upper classes were "light color," descendants in the main from the Aryan conquerors; whereas the Sudras were "dark color," conquered Dravidians.

As time passed, many of the conquerors married the darker native women, and the distinction between white and black was not so clear. Perhaps it was partly to preserve their pride of race that the higher classes became increasingly strict in their rules against marrying or mingling with colored people. One must not speak to a Sudra, or eat food contaminated by the touch of a low-caste person. One must not marry outside his own caste. There were new castes, too. As civilization increased, fewer men were jacks-of-all-trades. Chariot-making, carpentry, blacksmithing, and other trades became not merely hereditary professions but rigid castes. The chariot-maker's son must be a chariot-maker and marry a chariot-maker's daughter.

Transmigration of Souls. — This development of castes was closely connected with the idea of the transmigration of souls. If a man's spirit, after death, is to be born again in the body of a dog, or of a Sudra, or of a Brahman, according to the merits of his life, it is natural to conclude that in his present body each man enjoys the station in life which he merited by his past lives. Each man, therefore, should be content with his social position, and by fulfilling his duties strive to merit a better position in his next life. Such a view of life does not stimulate ambition and progress; it preaches resignation and it breeds social injustice. As we have said, the higher castes looked with scorn on the lower classes.

India from 1200 to 600 B.C. — Such were the lines along which the Aryans were developing their civilization in India during the

period between about 1200 B.C. and 600 B.C. The Aryans were spreading into eastern India. Industry and commerce were growing. Gold gradually took the place of cows as the unit of money-value. The warrior chieftains of the early Aryans were now becoming more powerful as hereditary rulers of petty kingdoms. A few monarchies were becoming fairly large states, striving to grow larger. But none was large enough to offer effective resistance if any of the great military nations of the West should invade India, and that was subsequently to occur.[1]

Mayas, Aztecs, and Incas

Asiatic Origin of American Indians. — At this point we may well turn aside from Old World history to discover what was happening in the western hemisphere. Although it is always possible that fossil skeletons may be found proving man to be no more recent in the New World than in the Old, nevertheless at present it seems more likely that the first men entered America from Asia. The American Indians show more resemblances, in physical characteristics, to the peoples of Asia than to those of Europe and Africa. For this and other reasons they are regarded as distant cousins of the Mongols and Chinese and Malays. Perhaps they crossed over to America by way of the Aleutian Islands, which are strung out like stepping stones between Siberia and Alaska; or perhaps they crossed Bering Strait, where the two continents are now only 56 miles apart, and where they may formerly have been connected. Probably there were a number of migrations.

The coming of the Indians, if this theory is correct, must have been a very long time ago, because it would take many generations for them to develop their different languages and customs, and to become different, one tribe from another, in physical appearance as well as in speech and culture. Some writers think ten thousand years would be none too many to allow for this process. Some allow even more.

The Stone Age Indians. — We may imagine the first Indian pioneers as Stone Age people, able to chip stone into weapons and

[1] See below, pp. 168, 227.

tools, familiar with the useful trick of making fire by rubbing sticks, skillful in art of basketry, but ignorant of agriculture, cattle-raising, metals, pottery, and writing. Where game was plentiful, apparently, some tribes remained in the condition of roving hunters. Plenty is not the mother of invention.

Agriculture. — A higher culture developed, however, on the arid tablelands which extend from southwestern United States



Courtesy of the American Museum of Natural History

ONE OF THE OLDEST GREAT BUILDINGS IN AMERICA. MAYAN BUILDING AT CHICHEN ITZA IN YUCATAN

A photograph of a model in the American Museum of Natural History, showing how the ancient building, now in ruins, would probably appear if it were reconstructed. Part of the building, in the model, is cut away to reveal the method by which the Mayan architects built such edifices.

southward through Mexico and Central America, narrowing in the isthmus, and spreading out again along the western coast of South America. On the poorly watered plateau game may not have

been abundant, and men depended more on plant food. Agriculture began. Instead of cultivating the wheat and barley so familiar in the Old World, or the rice so characteristic of southeastern Asia, the first American farmers grew maize or Indian corn, which was then unknown in the Old World. Corn (maize) must have been an American wild plant, improved by breeding. Various vegetables were also domesticated, such as the sweet potato in Mexico and the white potato in Peru.

Irrigation. — In many parts of the plateau lands such crops could not be grown without artificial irrigation. And irrigation, because it requires coöperation and systematic work, means that men forsake the wandering life of the hunter, and settle down as farmers. It is then only a step to the building of villages and cities, with temples and palaces and works of art. Irrigation meant civilization in the American plateau, just as it did in the Nile Valley and in Mesopotamia.

Rise of Civilization. — Somewhere, then, on the lofty, dry plateaus of southern Mexico or of Central America, an agricultural civilization arose. The shaping of clay into pots and bowls, and into rather crude figures of men and women, and the art of loom-weaving, seem to have developed in this same region. North and south these inventions were spread, first on the high and dry plateaus, and then into the plains and lowlands. Ultimately agriculture and weaving were adopted as far north as the region of the Great Lakes, and almost as far south as Tierra del Fuego.

Metals were discovered, too. Here and there veins of copper were found on the surface, where they could easily be worked; and in some parts of North America the Indians found nuggets of copper which had been scattered by glaciers. Gold, silver, and tin were also known. Generally, however, these metals were used for ornaments rather than for tools or weapons.

After a time brilliant civilizations arose in Mexico, Central America, and Peru, where temple-builders and sculptors have left monuments rivalling those of ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia. These New World civilizations, however, were three or four thousands of years later than those of the Old World. In America, the building of splendid cities, temples, and palaces

seems to have begun with the Mayas (mä′yäz), between 1000 B.C. and the time of Christ, that is, two or three thousand years after the construction of the Egyptian pyramids.

Maya Civilization. — The Mayas conquered the lowlands of Central America. That is to say, by clearing away the forests, they obtained richer crops than were possible on the arid plateaus. Wealth and population multiplied. In the cities splendid palaces and temples were built around a broad square or plaza. The dwellings of the common people may have been little more than huts, for all we know, but the palaces and temples were imposing affairs, built of concrete and stone. By burning limestone they obtained lime, which was slaked to form mortar, and mortar mixed with broken stone gave them concrete. Walls and columns of concrete were smoothly surfaced with stone masonry. Durable the Maya buildings undoubtedly were, but they were also clumsy and ponderous. The rooms were rarely more than ten or twelve feet wide, because a heavy vaulted ceiling of concrete, not supported by girders or by arches and domes, would be unsafe if the room were large. The palaces sometimes had more than one story but the space under the upper stories had to be filled solidly with earth or concrete, to support the great weight, and as a result the palace was really a sort of terraced pyramid with a solid center.

Courtesy of the Museum of Natural History

A Mayan Monument

This monument, carved from one large block of stone, shows the typical features of ancient Mayan art.

The most impressive sight in a Maya city must have been the great artificial mound on the summit of which rose several flat-topped pyramids, each crowned with a stone temple.

Mayan Art. — As artists the Mayas showed remarkable talent. They made very beautiful clay bowls and vases, painted in colored designs. They made charming ornaments of carved jade, or of copper and gold. It was in sculpture, however, that their masterpieces were achieved. Among the ruins of their cities have been found great stone slabs, elaborately carved. Their temples were adorned with sculpture.

Courtesy of the American Museum of Natural History

AN EXAMPLE OF MAYAN SCULPTURE

It would be an exaggeration to say that Mayan artists excelled the Egyptians in picturing the human body in graceful and natural poses; yet one can hardly refuse to admire their sculptured portraits of priests in elaborate robes; of kings on their thrones; of warriors with spear and shield. On the other hand, few Americans are likely to derive much pleasure from pictures of cowering captives bound in ropes or trampled under foot, or from the favorite subject of Mayan art — a monstrous snake, with jaguar's teeth and yawning jaws, between which a human head appears.

Mayan Writing. — Two other indications of Mayan civilization are worth remembering. The Mayas invented a system of hieroglyphic writing. They wrote on bark, on deerskin, or on paper made from the fiber of the maguey (century plant). A few of their books have been preserved. The hieroglyphs are remarkable from an artistic point of view; but unfortunately they have not yet been completely deciphered.

The Mayan Calendar. — The other point is that the Mayas devised a remarkable calendar, based on a month of twenty days. Eighteen such months and an additional month of five days made a year of 365 days. This calendar in itself indicates careful observation of the sun and moon; but furthermore the Mayas knew that to be accurate one should add a little less than one day every four years, or twenty-five days in 104 years.

The Mayan Migration. — The Maya cities in Central America flourished during the period, roughly speaking, from 100 to 600 A.D. They had doubtless been built some time before that, and the calendar (580 B.C.) and writing had already been invented. After 600 A.D. the Mayans migrated into the northern part of the great flat peninsula of Yucatan, leaving their old cities to be grown over by the tropical forest. In Yucatan, Mayan civilization bloomed once more from about 1000 to 1442 A.D. That was the period of the League of Mayapan, when the three great cities of Mayapan (mī-yȧ-pän′), Uxmal (o̅oz-mäl′), and Chichen Itza (chē-chān′ēt-zä′) formed a powerful confederacy. But the League broke up, civil war ruined the country, and Mayan civilization sank into weakness and decay.

The Toltecs. — It was probably from the Mayas that the Toltecs learned the arts of civilization. The Toltecs were one of the numerous Indian tribes speaking the Nahuan language, who migrated from the north (possibly from the Colorado River), and settled in the southern part of the Mexican plateau. Like the Mayas they learned to build palaces and temple-crowned pyramids. Indeed, their pyramids, though of poorer workmanship, were even larger than those of their teachers. The Toltec pyramid at Cholula is bigger than the Great Pyramid of Egypt,

though less than half as high. We are chiefly concerned with the Toltecs here, however, as being the people who planted on the high plateau the culture which the Mayas had created in the low coast-lands.

Courtesy of the American Museum of Natural History

AN AZTEC GIRL BEING TAUGHT TO SPIN

Aztec Rule in Mexico. — The Mexican plateau, then, had already been civilized by the Toltecs, when the more famous Aztecs entered the region — if we may believe their legends — as barbarian hunters, ignorant of grain and of weaving. Like the Toltecs, they came from the north, perhaps from California, perhaps not so far. At any rate, they arrived at the spot where Mexico City now stands and there they found a lake, with islands on which they could build their thatched huts secure from enemies. Gradually their village grew into a city, and artificial islands were created. It was a sort of American Venice, but seven thousand feet above sea-level. Rapidly the Aztecs assimilated the culture of their neighbors. Soon they formed an alliance with two neighboring cities, and conquered the country for many miles about. By the middle of the fifteenth century they dominated central Mexico, and their

Courtesy of the American Museum of Natural History

AZTEC GIRL BEING TAUGHT TO WEAVE

capital was becoming a great city. They had learned to write, and to divide the year into months, and to mine copper, tin, and gold, and to erect magnificent palaces and temples of concrete and stone masonry. They were the heirs of the Mayan and Toltec civilizations.

The Dark Side. — The picture has its darker side, which is significant. All through the old Central American and Mexican civilizations there ran a dark streak of savage superstition, of serpent-worship and human sacrifice. The Mayas and Toltecs had shown special fondness for the rattlesnake and for blood-curdling snakelike monsters in their pictures of their gods, and had practised human sacrifice to some extent. With the Aztecs this trait became a habit. There is an Aztec statue of the earth-goddess, Coatlicue (kō-ät-lē′kwā), whose head appears to be formed of two snake-heads; her hands are snake-heads; her feet are claws; her skirt is of embroidered snakes; and round her neck she wears a string of human hands and hearts, with a skull for a locket.

Courtesy of the American Museum of Natural History

An Aztec Girl Being Punished for Not Spinning Properly

Even more gruesome were the ceremonies by which the Aztecs worshipped their gods. To the rain-gods little children, with faces gaily painted, were sacrificed by the priests. For another god, the creator of the world, each year the handsomest young man taken captive by Aztec warriors was selected as a victim. For a year he was treated as a king, given rich robes, and every luxury. Then he was ferried across the lake, and led up the stairs that wound around the temple pyramid, until at the top he was met by six black-robed priests. There, in the light of the sacred

fires that perpetually burned on the altars, he was stretched on a huge block of stone and his heart was swiftly cut out of his living body, to be cast at the feet of the idol. After that, the body was eaten at a banquet by Aztec aristocrats and their wives. Each year thousands of human victims, mostly captives, were sacrificed and eaten.

Courtesy of the American Museum of Natural History

ANCIENT MEXICAN GOD OF RAIN

The Inca Empire in Peru. — The story of the Inca Empire in Peru makes more pleasant reading. When the Spanish entered Peru as conquerors in the sixteenth century, they found there a civilized state that had existed, apparently, for several centuries. The king or emperor, known as the Inca, was a man of no small culture and intelligence. Through an elaborate system of officials he ruled his people as a general commands an army. To each farmer was assigned just the amount of land he could cultivate, so we are told. A third of the produce went to the Inca, a third to the temples, and a third was left for the farmer. Labor was compulsory and was systematically regulated by the Inca's officials. Some of the men were sent off into the mountains for a period of a few months at a time to work in the silver, copper, tin, or lead mines. Others washed the streams for gold.

Military service, like labor, was universal and compulsory for men. Armed with bows and arrows for long-range fighting, and with lances, battle-axes, and clubs for hand-to-hand combat, the

troops of the Inca added one province after another to his realm, until it included Ecuador on the north and much of Chile on the south. Marvellous military highways, paved with stone slabs, were built with enormous expenditure of labor, stretching thousands of miles through fertile land and bleak desert and rugged mountain country, regardless of engineering difficulties.

Courtesy of the American Museum of Natural History

AN INCA RULER

A modern painting, carefully based on studies of ancient Peruvian remains.

Glories of Cuzco. — The capital at Cuzco (kōōs′kō) must have been an imposing affair. To be sure, the houses and palaces had only thatched roofs, perhaps because in a volcanic country subject to earthquakes a heavier roof might have been dangerous. But the Peruvians were master masons. The temples were built of massive blocks of stone so carefully fitted together that one cannot insert a knife-blade in the cracks.

The great Temple of the Sun at Cuzco had a thick band of gold running around its outside walls. Inside was a great hall, without windows, but with walls covered with plates of gold. At the eastern end was a large sheet of gold representing the face of the sun-god, with rays of solid gold. On either side were golden thrones, on which sat the mummified bodies of former Incas. At dawn the rising sun shone through the door on the golden image of the sun-god, and was reflected by the gold on the walls, until the hall must have gleamed in golden glory.

Governed by able rulers, subject to laws that seem as wise as they are unusual, rich in crops and metals, successful in war, civilized to a degree indicated by the fact that elaborate romantic

dramas were performed, the Inca kingdom has inspired enthusiastic admiration.

The Modern World Indebted to the American Indians. — It may be interesting, before we take leave of ancient America, to point out that in a very real sense the modern world is heir to the American Indians as well as to the ancient Egyptians, the Babylonians, the Cretans and Syrians, the Greeks and Romans, the Chinese and Hindus. The American Indians domesticated and passed on to us a large number of valuable food plants, such as corn, potatoes, tomatoes, pumpkins, squash, lima beans, kidney beans, pineapples, strawberries, peanuts, guava, persimmons, cassava. To them the world owes tobacco, quinine, cocaine, and cascara.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. What geographical obstacles form a barrier between the Far East and the Near East? Has this barrier been overcome by modern means of communication? What effect did it have in ancient times upon the development of civilization in China and India?

2. Discuss the various theories of the origin of the Chinese nation.

3. How much historical truth is there in the Chinese legends regarding the Heavenly, Terrestrial, and Human Emperors?

4. What was the condition of China under the Chóu Dynasty?

5. Compare the Chinese system of writing with those of the Egyptians, Babylonians, and Phœnicians.

6. What was the state of civilization in Japan at the time when Nineveh was destroyed?

7. From what source do we learn most of what we know about the early history of the Aryans in India? Why is it believed that the Aryans of India were one of the Indo-European family of peoples? Why is language an unreliable test of race?

8. Explain the caste system.

9. Compare the civilization of the Aryans in India with that of the Iranians, or of the Egyptians, or of the Assyrians, or of the Chinese, in the period 1200–600 B.C.

10. Compare the dates of Maya civilization with the dates of the Egyptian pyramid-builders; of Hammurabi; of Zoroaster; of the Zend Avesta; of the Chóu Dynasty.

11. What differences can you discover between the earliest American civilizations and the civilizations of the Old World?

SPECIAL TOPICS

The earliest Americans. KROEBER, *Anthropology*, 343–354; WILDER, *Man's Prehistoric Past*, 283–296; SPINDEN, *Ancient Civilizations of Mexico and Central America*, 47–56.

The Iroquois. GOLDENWEISER, *Early Civilizations*, 70–82.

Our debt to the American Indians. SPINDEN, *Ancient Civilizations of Mexico and Central America*, 224.

The Mayas. WILDER, *Man's Prehistoric Past*, 344–350; SPINDEN, *Ancient Civilizations of Mexico and Central America*, 65–82; ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA, new vols., I, 194.

Toltecs and Aztecs. SPINDEN, *Ancient Civilizations of Mexico and Central America*, 177–189; ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA, new vols., I, 195.

Moundbuilders. WILDER, *Man's Prehistoric Past*, 354–361.

The Aryans or Indo-Europeans. MYRES, *Dawn of History*, 189–217; KROEBER, *Anthropology*, ch. iii. CAMBRIDGE HISTORY OF INDIA, I, ch. iii.

The *Rig Veda*. SMITH, *Oxford History of India*, 16–24; CAMBRIDGE HISTORY OF INDIA, I, ch. iv.

Caste in India. SMITH, *Oxford History of India*, 34–42.

Geographic background of Chinese civilization. WILLIAMS, *China Yesterday and Today*, 1–31.

Origin of Chinese civilization. WILLIAMS, *China Yesterday and Today*, 32–53.

Chinese legendary history. W. E. GRIFFIS, *China's Story*, 43–57; HIRTH, *Ancient History of China*, 3–44; GOWEN and HALL, *Outline History of China*, 23–44.

The Chinese family and ancestor-worship. WILLIAMS, *China Yesterday and Today*, 54–69, 249–262.

Early Japan. LATOURETTE, *Development of Japan*, 1–20.

The Chôu dynasty in China. GOWEN and HALL, *Outline History of China*, 45–64.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THE TEACHER

H. H. WILDER, *Man's Prehistoric Past*, 283–383. H. H. GOWEN and J. W. HALL, *Outline History of China*. H. H. GOWEN, *Asia, a Short History*. E. H. PARKER, *Ancient China*. E. T. WILLIAMS, *China Yesterday and Today*. F. HIRTH, *The Ancient History of China*. E. J. RAPSON (ed.), *Cambridge History of India*, I. H. J. SPINDEN, *Ancient Civilizations of Mexico and Central America*.

Interior of the Parthenon

A modern representation of how the interior of the Parthenon appeared in the fifth century B.C. The Parthenon was perhaps the loveliest of the architectural achievements of the Classical Civilization in Greece. It was built on the Acropolis at Athens, in the time of Pericles, as a pagan temple in honor of the protectress of Athens, the goddess Athena. The picture represented here is of the larger of the two halls into which the interior of the Parthenon was divided. The statue in the picture is of the goddess Athena; it was made by the famous sculptor Phidias, and was thirty feet tall. For a picture of the exterior of the Parthenon and a description of the famous building, see pages 193–194

PART II

CLASSICAL CIVILIZATION IN THE GREEK CITY-STATES

Introduction

The origin of the word "classical" is worth noting. In ancient Rome citizens of the highest social rank were called "*classici*," and sometimes this word was applied to writers: the best writers were "classic," that is, first-rate. Hence a "classic" is a writer or a work of the highest excellence. So brilliant were the achievements of ancient Greece and Rome in art, literature, and philosophy, that the writings of Greek and Roman authors are generally known as the "classics," and Græco-Roman civilization is described as "classical" civilization. Most of our attention in the following three chapters will be devoted to tracing the development of a classical civilization among the ancient Greeks and its expansion throughout the Near East by Alexander's conquests. In later chapters of Part III we shall trace its further diffusion in the Roman Empire.

But we shall not confine ourselves exclusively to the Græco-Roman world. Although nowadays the adjective "classical" may be applied in a narrow sense to ancient Greek and Roman culture, it might well be used in a broader sense to describe all the great ancient civilizations which produced masterpieces of art and literature to be admired by future ages. Thus Confucius is just as much a classic for the Chinese to-day as Homer is for Europeans or Americans. Accordingly, we shall deal not only with the development of classical civilizations in Greece and Rome but also, in Part IV, with their rise in India and China and with the relations between them. If we are to have any true perspective of world history, we must take this broader view.

CHAPTER V

THE RISE OF THE GREEK CITY-STATES

What the Greeks Inherited

Our Debt to the Greeks. — It would not be wholly untrue to say that you, who read this book, are Greeks. You are Greeks in the sense that many of your ideas and ideals are Greek. The very letters in which these words are printed are modernized forms of the letters of the Greek alphabet. Democracy is a Greek idea, and the word itself is Greek. Our ideals of beauty have been shaped by Greek sculptors. The Greek Aphrodite (Venus) is a type of perfect feminine loveliness. The Parthenon is still a model for architects. When you study geometry, you are learning the theorems worked out by the ancient Greeks. Greek philosophers and poets and dramatists still find readers, and still

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

Early Greek Art

Part of a hunting scene, from a fresco at Tiryns, showing two persons in a chariot. Probable date, 1500–1100 B.C.

influence modern thought. Even in our athletic sports the "marathon" and "Olympic" contests remind us of ancient Greece.

What the Greeks Inherited from Prehistoric Culture. — The ancient Greeks, however, in their turn owed an immense debt to other and earlier civilizations. It may be well, therefore, to ask:

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

EARLY GREEK ART

Another part of the hunting scene, from the fresco at Tiryns, showing a hunter with dog and horse.

What did the Greeks inherit? Language, fire, the use of tools and weapons had come down to them from the earliest age of man. The Old Stone Age had added spears, harpoons, bows and arrows, sewing, painting and carving, and jewelry. Still later, in the New Stone Age various peoples had learned the valuable secrets of

growing grain, domesticating animals, grinding and polishing stone, building fairly solid houses, making pots and jars of clay, spinning thread and weaving cloth, and constructing wagons on wheels.

From Early Civilizations. *Metals.* — Later on, copper, gold, silver, and other metals had been discovered. Then Egypt, Mesopotamia, Crete, and other countries had learned to use bronze weapons and tools; and bronze was being replaced by iron before the Greeks played any prominent part in history.

Arts. — More than this, the art of hewing stone and building it into temples and palaces had been developed by the Egyptians; the Greeks had only to carry it on with more elegance and grace. Columns and colonnades had been used in Egypt. The secret of the arch and the dome had been discovered by Egyptian and Assyrian builders, though for some reason the Greeks did not use it to any great extent. The idea of making large statues in stone, Greece owed to Egypt. The beautiful sculptured friezes of Greek temples had forerunners in Thebes, Babylon, and Nineveh. The painting of pottery was an ancient art which the Greeks merely continued and perfected. Musical instruments had been invented and enjoyed by many generations in other lands before the Greeks played lyre or flute.

Writing and Science. — Writing the Greeks learned from their older neighbors, and the Greek alphabet was borrowed from the Phœnicians.[1] The calendar had been worked out and a wealth of astronomical observation had been accumulated by Egyptian[2] and Babylonian star-gazers. The Egyptians had laid the foundations of arithmetic and geometry.[3] Though mixed with much magic and mummery, the medical knowledge of Egyptian and Assyrian medicine-men was not without value as a starting-point for Greek doctors.

Political Institutions. — Forms of government had gone through many changes. In Egypt tribal states had been consolidated into a kingdom, the kingdom had broken up into small states ruled by noblemen, and these in turn had been replaced by an aggressive empire, and that in time had decayed. In Assyria the art of organizing a militaristic empire had been highly developed. In

[1] See pp. 82–83. [2] See p. 38. [3] See p. 72–73.

Mesopotamia and in Phœnicia the city-state form of government had sprung up.

Variety and Progress. — One very important point to be emphasized is that the arts, industries, ideas, and institutions of the ancient peoples, before the Greeks took a hand in history, were rich in variety as well as in number. There were numerous forms of writing among which the Greeks might choose — Egyptian hieroglyphs carved on stone or written in cursive form on papyrus, Assyrian cuneiform impressed on clay tablets, Phœnician and

The sky was considered the abode of the gods and certain mythical creatures, who were given definite places in the heavens, as here indicated by stars and circles on the figures.



Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

CHART OF THE STARS IN THE REGION OF THE NORTH POLE

An Egyptian representation of astronomy, which was handed on to the Greeks. From a wall-painting in the tomb of Seti I, in the Valley of the Kings. Nineteenth Dynasty (about 1300 B.C.).

other Syrian alphabetic writing, and Cretan clay tablets. The Babylonians and Assyrians had built palaces and temples mainly in brick, while the Egyptians had used stone. There was a bewildering variety of religions, of political and social institutions, of fashions in dress and styles in art. Variety is the spice of progress, for it stimulates comparison and innovation. Instead of simply aping their predecessors, the Greeks could pick and choose, combine and modify, adapt and invent.

Freedom from Conservatism. — Another point to remember is that the Greeks had the advantage of being barbarians, at a time when stagnation was beginning in older countries such as Egypt.

For instance, Egyptian artists were too apt to imitate the old masters, instead of striking out into new paths. The Babylonians, to use an even clearer illustration, continued to use their clumsy cuneiform and their clay tablets for writing, long after easier methods had been invented, because their literature and records had been written in cuneiform for so many centuries. You can see the same principle at work today. One of the chief objections to adopting a simplified form of spelling for the English language is that it would mean abandoning the time-honored form in which our language was written by the masters of English literature. As soon as a thing becomes time-honored, it cannot easily be improved. People have so much respect and veneration for it, that they are loath to change it. But barbarians and strangers lack such reverence. The Egyptian might feel that all things should be done in the old Egyptian ways; whereas the Greek could borrow the Egyptian's papyrus, but write on it a barbarian Indo-European language in a modified Semitic alphabet. The Greek was the heir of the past, but, being an outsider and a barbarian at the start, he was not the slave of antiquity.

From Homer's Heroes to the Iron Age

Cretan Culture in Greece. — Greece and the Greeks were outside the bounds of the really civilized ancient world until about 1600 B.C. The island of Crete, however, had long been in touch, through trade, with Egypt and other civilized lands, and through Crete a rich Ægean civilization spread to the backward peninsula of Greece, about 1600 B.C.[1] On hilltops at Mycenæ, Tiryns, and other places on the Greek mainland, castles were built in which lived kings or princes who were certainly Cretan in their culture if not in their blood. Perhaps they were Cretan adventurers, who conquered principalities for themselves in the barbarian land. Perhaps they were not Cretans, but pirate kings, who preyed on Cretan trade. At any rate, they lived, dressed, fought, hunted, and watched bull-fights in the best Cretan style, and their ladies wore the fashionable Cretan flounced dresses, tight waists, and low necks.

[1] See p. 76.

The "Mycenæan Age." — In the tombs of the kings at Mycenæ were found glittering hoards of golden vases and cups, diadems, bronze daggers and swords inlaid with gold, after the fashion of Cretan goldsmiths. Perhaps it was one of these kings who pillaged Crete, about 1400 B.C., and with plundered wealth rebuilt his own castle at Mycenæ on a grander scale, with massive walls and spacious halls, bathrooms, stairways, and painted frescoes. Certain it is that Mycenæ was powerful in the fourteenth and

RUINS OF ANCIENT MYCENÆ

thirteenth centuries. In fact, some historians speak of this period (1400–1200 B.C.) as the "Mycenæan (mī′sē-nē′ăn) Age" in Greece.

Before 1200 B.C. the rulers of Mycenæ and other cities were overthrown, probably by invaders. The new rulers were Greeks in speech, religion, and certain social customs; but they appropriated the old Mycenæan castles and adopted Mycenæan civilization, with the exception of religion. These new Greek rulers are the "Achæan" (*ȧ*-kē′*ă*n) heroes about whom Homer sang.

Homer. — Homer, according to an old tradition, was a Greek poet, blind and aged, who composed the "Iliad" (ĭl'ĭ-ăd) and the "Odyssey" (ŏd'ĭ-sĭ), long epic poems describing the Trojan War and the subsequent adventures of one of the warriors, Odysseus. Some critics deny that he was the author of his poems, while others refuse to believe that he ever lived. The weight of evidence seems to be on the side of the view that Homer did live, in the ninth century B.C., and that he composed the "Iliad" and the "Odyssey," basing his story on the romantic lays which minstrels had sung to the accompaniment of the lyre in the palaces of Greek princes for generation after generation before his time.

As the events he describes occurred three centuries earlier, successive generations of minstrels doubtless had exaggerated the deeds of the ancient heroes. Moreover, the later bards (*rhapsodes*) who recited Homer's poems from memory, may have introduced alterations. Numerous mistakes crept into the narrative. For example, occasionally iron is mentioned, although it probably had not come into general use in the days of Homer's heroes. With such reservations, however, Homer's poems may be taken as a picture of Greek life in the twelfth century B.C.

The Homeric Age. — Greece in the twelfth century B.C. was divided among a number of kings whose valor was great but whose realms were small. Chief among these kingdoms was Mycenæ, ruled by Agamemnon, the recognized leader of the Achæan kings. Each king proudly traced his ancestry back to some god or divine hero. Each was the leader of his people in war, their supreme judge in peace, and their representative in making sacrifices of oxen to the gods. His power, however, was far from absolute, for custom required him to call a council of his nobles to decide on important matters, and when the decision was reached it was announced to an assembly of the freemen for their approval. At least some of the common people were slaves or serfs, but of these humble ploughmen and herdsmen Homer rarely tells us much. His heroes were the Achæan nobles and kings.

Life of the Upper Class. — In time of peace the heroes amused themselves by hunting, or by feasting on roast beef. One of them said: "There is no more perfect pleasure than to sit at one's place

among the banqueters in a palace-hall, and listen to a minstrel, when the tables are laden with bread and meat, and the cupbearer draws wine from the mixing-bowl and pours it in the goblets." The mixing-bowl and goblets were of gold or silver, wrought with artistic pictures of hunting or war. A palace-hall, as described by Homer, had gleaming walls covered with bronze and decorated

THE LION GATE AT MYCENÆ

with a blue frieze; the doors were overlaid with gold and the door-posts with silver; logs blazed in the great fireplace.

Religion. — The gods of the Achæan Greeks were many. As Homer portrays him, Zeus, hurler of the thunderbolt, dweller on high Olympus, is father of gods and men, a figure of majesty and power; yet he is strangely human, for he sleeps, and feasts, and can be deceived, and occasionally has love-affairs with mortal women. The gray-eyed goddess Athena, who sprang full-armed

from the brow of Zeus, seems to be a special friend and ally of the Greeks. Hera, the proud wife of Zeus, is inclined to outbursts of temper and — with good reason — of jealousy. Poseidon, with his trident, is brother of Zeus and god of the sea. Aphrodite is the beautiful goddess of love. The list is too long to complete. To these gods men offer sacrifices and make vows, hoping to win favor or avert anger. Through soothsayers, seers, oracles, and dreams the gods advise or warn men. The gods share men's feasts of roasted beef and enjoy libations of wine. Semi-divine heroes, favored children of the gods, do not die, but are transported to the Elysian Fields, a paradise in the west, but the spirits of ordinary men descend to the gloomy realm ruled by Hades and Persephone.

Hospitality. — One of the most attractive features of Achæan aristocracy was the emphasis placed on hospitality. The stranger and guest must be entertained with the best the house afforded, and sent on their way with princely gifts. To refuse hospitality or to injure a guest was to offend the gods.

The Trojan War. — This brings us to the cause of the Trojan War. Homer tells us that the palace of King Menelaus (mĕn′ē-lā′ŭs) at Sparta in Lacedæmon (lăs′ē-dē′mŏn, southern part of the Peloponnesus), was visited by a foreign prince, young Paris, son of the King of Troy. Menelaus, of course, entertained his guest royally. But Paris proved ungrateful. Helen, wife of Menelaus, was so ravishingly beautiful that Paris fell in love with her and, when he departed, took her with him to Troy, across the Ægean Sea. To recover the fair queen, and to avenge this outrageous violation of hospitality, Menelaus and his brother

MENELAUS AND HELEN
Their meeting after the capture of Troy, as pictured on an old Greek vase.

Agamemnon summoned all the other Achæan kings to join with them in a war against Troy.

The warriors, with their horses and chariots, embarked in little ships, and the expedition sailed across the Ægean to Troy, on the Asiatic shore, near the Dardanelles. On the plain near the frowning walls of Troy the Greeks [illegible] d their tents. Much of the fighting consisted of duels, such as the mortal combat between Achilles and Hector. The rival heroes rode out to battle in two-horsed chariots, and wore bronze helmets with plumes of dyed horse-hair, bronze breastplates, greaves and shields to fend off the enemies' arrows and javelins. The armor of rich chieftains was inlaid with gold and silver in beautiful designs. When a warrior fell on the field, his enemies stopped fighting to strip his body of the precious armor, and to seize his chariot and horses, as well as his gold-hilted sword.

Failing to vanquish the Trojans in battle, the Greeks at last resorted to stratagem. Pretending to sail away, they left a large wooden horse, which the Trojans triumphantly dragged into their city. But the wooden horse contained Greek heroes, who stole out under cover of night to open the gates for the Greek army. So, at last, Troy fell. The ships of the victors sailed home laden with loot and captives, leaving ruins and ashes to tell the fate of Troy.

Fact and Fiction. — Much of this may be fiction. But there is some truth in the story, too. In the nineteenth century, three thousand years after the fall of Troy, a German business man by the name of Schliemann began to search for the ruins of Troy on the hill of Hissarlik, near the Asiatic shore of the Dardanelles. There the excavators found that no fewer than nine cities had been built, each on the ruins of its predecessor. The sixth city, built about the sixteenth century B.C., and surrounded by a stone wall fifteen feet thick, with strong gates and towers, answers to Homer's description well enough. Its ruins show clear signs that it had been destroyed by an enemy. Historians feel fairly sure that this was the Troy taken by the Achæans, and that the Trojan War occurred about the year 1200 B.C. Whether it was fought for Helen is a more difficult question. One good theory is that the

Achæans really fought Troy in order to gain control of the Strait of the Dardanelles, so that their ships could enter the Black Sea.

An Age of Plunder. — From other sources we know that the Achæans engaged in many such wars. Sometimes the motive was plunder. Sometimes it was the desire of some restless adventurer to seize a castle and a kingdom for himself. Thus an Achæan dynasty was established in Crete; another band of roving Achæans wandered as far as Egypt. After the fall of Troy, numerous Achæan principalities were established on the Asiatic side of the Ægean Sea. It was a golden age for the kind of heroes Homer describes — adventurous warriors, keen for battle, ready to conquer new lands, eager to capture cattle and to loot fallen cities, and willing to engage in piracy on occasion.

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

MYCENÆAN ART

Painting of a woman carrying a basket, from a fresco at Tiryns.

The Dark Age of Invasions. — The "Heroic Age" of the Achæan warriors was followed by a Dark Age. In the eleventh century B.C., the grandsons and great-grandsons of Homer's heroes were overwhelmed by fierce invaders from the north. Castle after castle fell before their onslaughts. Mycenæ was burned to the ground, Tiryns was destroyed, and many another town suffered the same fate. Some of the invaders took to the sea

and conquered the islands of Crete and Rhodes. Others crossed over to Asia Minor.

The Dorians. — According to an old Greek tradition, the newcomers were led by the Heraclids (hĕr′ȧ-klĭdz), determined to regain the kingdom of Argos, which had rightfully belonged to their semi-divine ancestor Heracles (hĕr′ȧ-klēz), the son of Zeus. Later the descendants of the invaders who settled in southern Greece were known as Dorians and the Greek dialect spoken in this region was called Doric, to distinguish it from the dialects (Ionic, Æolic, and Arcadian) used in other parts of Greece. We shall therefore speak of the invaders as Dorians (dō′rĭ-ănz).

Dawn of Iron Age. — It is probably not unfair to regard the Dorian invaders as less highly civilized than the older inhabitants. The entry of the Dorians into the Greek Peninsula was marked by the destruction of castles and the burning of cities, the decline of artistic metal-work, the substitution of rather crude geometrical patterns for realistic paintings on pottery vases and jars, and the introduction of a new style of garment — a loose cloak — which was fastened with a safety-pin. The old civilization which had been transplanted into Greece from Crete five hundred years earlier, and which in modified form had flourished in the Mycenæan and Homeric-Achæan ages, was now in part disappearing and in part being taken over by the invaders. The old civilization had been a Bronze Age civilization. The Dorians, however, used iron swords — perhaps that was the reason for their victory. With the Dorian Invasion the Iron Age dawns in Greece.

Who the Greeks Were. — It must already be clear that by the time the Greeks emerged into the full light of history they represented a fusion of several different peoples and cultures — Mycenæan, Achæan, Dorian, and so on. When, therefore, we speak of the "Greeks" in following pages, we mean simply the people who spoke the Greek language. They did not call themselves Greeks. They considered themselves primarily as members of some city or group of cities; they were Ionians (ī-ō′nĭ-ănz), or Æolians (ē-ō′lĭ-ănz), or Lacedæmonians, or Athenians, or Thebans. Yet in later times they did sometimes style themselves "Hellenes" (hĕl′ēnz), and some historians prefer to use that name instead of "Greeks."

(Similarly the adjective "Hellenic" (hĕ-lĕn′ĭk) may be used instead of "Greek," and the noun "Hellas" instead of "Greece," to denote the region inhabited by the Hellenes or Greeks.)

Commerce, Colonies, and Culture

Greek Expansion. — It is a mistake to think of ancient Greece as consisting of the Greek Peninsula alone. During the period 1200–1000 B.C., the Greeks spread across the Ægean to Asia Minor. Then, in a later period of expansion, between 750 and 550 B.C., they founded Greek cities on the more distant shores of the Black Sea and of the southern and western Mediterranean.

Ionia. — The first of these movements began even before the Trojan War. That was just one step in the process. After the victory, numerous Greek adventurers established petty principalities in the region once dominated by Troy. Still later, when the Dorian invasions filled the Greek Peninsula with turmoil, there were more overseas migrations, the most important of which was the Ionian Migration to the coasts and islands on the eastern side of the Ægean. Thus, during the period (roughly speaking) from 1200 to 1000 B.C., the eastern coasts and islands of the Ægean became Greek. The eastern settlements were regarded as forming three distinct groups, each group having a different dialect. In the north the island of Lesbos and twelve cities on the Asiatic coast were Æolian. In the extreme south were Dorian states, including the islands of Rhodes and Cos. In the center, wedged in between Æolians and Dorians, was Ionia, consisting of ten towns on the mainland and also the islands of Samos (sā′mŏs) and Chios (kī′ŏs). The Ionian cities were by all odds the most important.

Cultural Importance. — These eastern settlements played a most significant part in the development of ancient Greek civilization. For one thing, there were larger and more fertile plains and valleys to be cultivated, and a milder climate, in the islands and on the coasts at the eastern side of the Ægean. To be sure, these lands were already inhabited; but the non-Greek natives were reduced to the position of subject populations, supporting Greek ruling classes. Gradually the Greek aristocrats imposed their language and some of their own customs on the natives, and intermarried



THE ANCIENT HELLENIC



AND PHŒNICIAN WORLDS

with them. The blending of Greek and non-Greek meant also a blending of culture. The Greek cities on the coast of Asia Minor were stimulated by their contact with the ancient civilization that had spread over this region from Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Syria. It may be an exaggeration, but it is not wholly incorrect, to say that Athens and the other cities of the Greek peninsula became civilized through Ionia.

Miletus. — The history of Miletus (mī-lē′tŭs) may be used to illustrate this statement. On the shore of Asia Minor at the mouth of the Mæander (mē-ăn′dēr) River a city had flourished long before the Greeks arrived. Some time between 1200 and 1000 B.C., a band of Ionian Greeks landed from their ships, stormed the city, killed the native men, married the women, and built for themselves a new city, Miletus. The Mæander Valley was fertile, and through it trade with the interior of Asia Minor was carried on. Situated at the mouth of the river, on a fine natural harbor, Miletus soon became a great trading center.

Colonial Expansion. — By the eighth century, we find Milesian ships sailing into the Black Sea, to found daughter cities and to trade with the natives there. The new cities, in turn, founded colonies, until Miletus might boast that she was mother or grandmother to more than seventy towns on the southern shore of the Black Sea. From these she got flax, timber, iron and other metals, in exchange for her vases, jewelry, and cloth. Other colonies, situated on the northern coast of the Black Sea, sent her grain from the rich black lands of southern Russia, then called Scythia (sĭth′ĭ-*ȧ*), as well as cattle, honey, wax, fish, hides, salt, timber, amber, and slaves.

Trade with Egypt. — Meanwhile, Miletus was establishing commerce with Egypt. Even before 700 B.C. there was a Milesian trading post at the mouth of the Nile. Later, in the seventh century, another Greek settlement was established at Naucratis (nô′krȧ-tĭs), in the western part of the Nile Delta. There the Milesians and other Greeks carried on a lively trade, selling wine and pottery and oil, and buying papyrus and various other Egyptian products.

Trade with Italy. — Milesian ships also sailed far to the west, to

the town of Sybaris (sĭb′ä-rĭs), which had been founded in Italy about the year 720 B.C. by another Greek state (Achæa), but which traded chiefly with Miletus. Because of its fertile land, but even more because of its favored position as a port for ships from the east, Sybaris became a great and wealthy city, famed for its luxury and its cooks. Even to this day we use the word Sybaritic as a synonym for luxurious. From Miletus the Sybarites purchased

Courtesy of Philadelphia Commercial Museum

GREEK MERCHANT SHIPS

their woollen cloaks. And through Sybaris the Milesians sent Greek and Egyptian goods to Etruria, a non-Greek land in central Italy.[1]

Thales. — With such extensive maritime commerce, Miletus became the wealthiest and greatest of Greek cities in the seventh and sixth centuries B.C. Her greatness was not merely in wealth, or in naval power, but in culture as well. The philosopher Thales (thā′lēz, 640–546 B.C.), whom the Greeks regarded as the first of

[1] See below, pp. 246–248.

the seven sages, was a Milesian. By visiting Egypt, as so many Milesian business men did, Thales became acquainted with Egyptian geometry and astronomy. He developed the practical geometrical rules of the Egyptians into abstract principles and laid the foundations of Greek geometry, which is our geometry. He likewise won fame as an astronomer by predicting an eclipse. His pupils and their followers made Miletus a center for philosophy and science, and their work paved the way for the later and greater thinkers of Athens.

Ionian Art. — Miletus and other Ionian cities were centers of art, as well as of commerce, sea-power, science, and philosophy. It was among them that the Ionic type of architecture, with its well-proportioned fluted columns, first arose. Among them the art of sculpture, too, was early developed. Perhaps it was from Egypt that the Ionians borrowed the idea of carving large statues in stone. At any rate, the Ionian sculptors became so famous that they were often employed by Greek cities such as Athens, and they may well be given credit for introducing the art among the Greeks.

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

AN IONIAN STATUE OF THE SIXTH CENTURY B.C.

Sappho. — The Ionian and Æolic cities were also the cradles of Greek literature. Homer is supposed to have lived in Chios, one of the Ionian islands. Sappho (săf′ō), perhaps the greatest poetess of all time and certainly the most famous, was a native of the Æolian city of Mytilene (mĭt′ĭ-lē′nē), on the island of Lesbos. She was the sister of a merchant who sold wine to Egypt. Her husband must have been involved in politics, for he was banished, and she with him. After his death she returned to her native city and established a "house of the Muses," a sort of school for girls who wished to learn

music, dancing, and poetry. Music and poetry went together. The shorter emotional poems, or lyrics, were always sung, in those days, to the accompaniment of the lyre, the flute, or the harp. A lyric poet was really a singer and a song-writer. Of the songs written by Sappho we can never know the music, but the words of the few that have been preserved are exquisite expressions of affection for her pupils, or of sorrow and grief. Plato called her the "tenth Muse," and often she was referred to as "the poetess," in the same way that the incomparable Homer was styled "the poet."

SAPPHO
A statue now in the Vatican Museum.

Coinage of Money. — To Ionia, also, we must turn if we seek the beginnings of Greek coinage. Before money was invented, trading took the form either of piracy and robbery, or else of barter. Barter means simply the exchanging of one commodity for another, of an ox for a necklace or a sack of grain for a vase. The next stage in the development of trade was the use of cows, or some other familiar object of value, as units for the calculation of prices. Still later, metal became the medium of exchange and the standard of value. Thus the Egyptians in very early times used rings of gold or of silver as money, and the early Greeks used rods or spits of bronze and iron. Such "money," needless to say, is inconvenient in form.

A great step forward was taken when real coins were made in

Lydia (lĭd′ĭ-*a*), a country in western Asia Minor, and in the Ionian towns. Such coins at first were made of "white gold" or electrum (gold and silver mixed) and stamped with a lion or a gryphon's head or some other symbol to guarantee their weight and quality. The final step was to mint pure gold coins and pure silver coins, of standard quality and convenient values. King Crœsus (krē′sŭs) of Lydia is said to have been the first to do this, about 550 B.C. He is therefore erroneously regarded, by many, as the inventor of money.

But long before he lived, the practice of issuing silver or electrum coins had been adopted among the Ionian cities and had spread, in the seventh century B.C., to a few Greek states farther west, such as Ægina (ē-jī′na). In the early sixth century Corinth, Athens, and other cities began to issue their own coins, and the use of money became universal (except in Sparta, as we shall see).

The effect of the introduction of coinage was of the utmost importance. It was a wonderful stimulus to trade. One of the most effective ways in which a city could extend its trade was to issue attractive reliable coins, for such coins would be readily taken by foreigners in payment for purchases. Again, coinage, as we shall explain presently, was one of the factors, along with the growth of trade and industry, which made the rich richer and the peasants poorer, and so caused discontent and revolutions in Greek states.

Eubœan Expansion. — In the development of overseas commerce and the founding of colonies Miletus had active rivals. Among these Chalcis (kăl′sĭs) and Eretria (ĕ-rē′trĭ-*a*), two Ionian cities on the long island of Eubœa (ū-bē′*a*), must at least be mentioned. These Eubœan cities were the inventors of a new form of warfare. Whereas in the Homeric age fighting took the form of disorderly hand-to-hand fighting, chiefly between noble charioteers, the "spear-famed lords of Eubœa" in the eighth century adopted the method of massing heavily armored foot-soldiers in a solid troop or "phalanx" (fā′lănks). Marching shoulder to shoulder, the spearmen in the front rank presented a solid wall of shields and long spears, against which unorganized enemies had little chance.

With their improved military tactics, the Eubœans found conquests easy, and took a prominent part in overseas expansion during the eighth and seventh centuries B.C. They colonized the triple peninsula of Chalcidice (kăl-sĭd′ĭ-sē), so named because the mother city was Chalcis, and the coasts of Thrace and Macedonia, on the northern shores of the Ægean. Chalcis also founded colonies in Sicily and Italy. The most famous and oldest of these was Cumæ (kū′mē), on the western coast of Italy (near the modern Naples). It was through Cumæ that the Chalcidian form of the Greek alphabet was carried into Italy, to be adopted, later on, by the Romans, and thus to become the ancestor of our own alphabet.

Corinth. — Let us turn now to another city, Corinth, situated at the southern end of the Isthmus of Corinth, in an admirable position for trade. Possibly the city was founded by Cretans or by Phœnician traders, before it became Greek; certainly the Phœnicians had a trading post there. In the twelfth century it was a Greek city, belonging to the kingdom of Mycenæ. But after the Dorian invasion, it became an important independent state, and in the eighth century it embarked on a career of colonial, commercial, and naval expansion. Its colony of Syracuse, founded in the year 734 B.C. on the eastern coast of Sicily, became in course of time one of the most powerful and cultured of Greek cities. The island of Corcyra (kôr-sī′ra) was another Corinthian colony.

The Corinthian "Tyrants." — The growth of commerce had interesting effects on the internal political life of Corinth. As the merchants grew in wealth and the workingmen increased in numbers, the small group of Dorian aristocrats who governed Corinth became more and more unpopular. Finally an adventurous leader arose, who dared to organize a revolt and seize the reins of power. To-day we should call Cypselus (sĭp′sĕ-lŭs) a dictator. The Greeks called him "tyrant," but the term implied only that he was an unconstitutional, not an oppressive, ruler. As a matter of fact, Cypselus must have been very popular with the merchant classes, for he issued the first Corinthian coinage and did his best to promote commerce.

His son Periander (pĕr′ĭ-ăn′dēr, 625–585 B.C.) was one of the most famous tyrants. He reconquered the colony of Corcyra,

which had revolted; he obtained other colonies which gave him control of the trade route from Macedonia across to Albania, and enabled him to exploit the silver mines of the eastern Adriatic coast. By constructing splendid public buildings and public baths he gave employment to many workingmen, and at the same time he won a high reputation as a patron of art and a beautifier of his city. Foreign artists and poets came to visit his court. His fame spread far and wide. The rulers of Egypt and of Lydia were his friends. Yet in his own city were many who longed to restore the old oligarchy (government controlled by a few men, instead of by one man), and throughout his life he dared not appear on the streets without a bodyguard. Not long after his death, the tyranny fell, and an oligarchy was established.

Tyrants in Greek Cities. — We have mentioned Periander because he may stand as a type of the tyrants that arose not only in Corinth but in several other Greek cities at this time.[1] The tyrants were, in a sense, often the champions of the masses against the classes. They arose by overthrowing conservative aristocracies of noble landowners. Often they emancipated the serfs. Usually they fostered commerce, industry, and architecture. They were generous patrons of art and poetry. Yet their position, resting on personal popularity or on force rather than on law and tradition, was always insecure, and rarely did a tyrant's throne last more than two or three generations.

Extent of Greek Colonization. — Of the other colonizing and commercial cities we have no space to write in any detail. But before we leave the subject, it will be well to repeat that in the period from about 750 to 550 B.C. Greek colonies were being planted far and wide. There were Greek cities all along the coasts of the Ægean and Black Seas, and in southern Italy and Sicily. Crete had Greek (Dorian) rulers. Sardinia and Corsica, in the western Mediterranean, and the Mediterranean coasts of France and Spain, likewise received adventurous Greek colonists. In fact, the modern French city of Marseilles is the old Greek colony of Massilia, Nice is the Greek Nicæa, Monaco the Greek Monœcus. On the southern shores of the Mediterranean was the

[1] For the tyrants of Athens, see below, pp. 154, 156–157.

colony of Cyrene (now part of the Italian colony of Libya). These far-flung colonies widened the Greek horizon and served to spread Greek culture.

Nature of Greek Colonization. — Ordinarily a colony became an independent city-state, rather than remaining a dependency of the mother-city. But so strong was the bond of religion and ancestry, that usually the colony remained bound to the mother-city by strong ties of sentiment and loyalty, and the mother-city considered herself the protectress and ally of her colonies.

The reasons for colonial expansion were various. In some cases the motive was adventure; in others, it was commerce. The two most prevalent causes, however, were overpopulation and political conflict. Overpopulation occurred frequently, because the Greek cities were small in area, and in many cases poor in natural resources. Political conflict produced a sort of artificial overpopulation. In the case of Corinth, for example, when Cypselus seized power he banished those of the aristocrats who were not killed. Often the opponents of the government, even without being formally banished, felt that they could find more healthful homes overseas.

Spartan Militarism

A Contrast. — No sharper contrast could be imagined than that between the progressive and cultured commercial cities which we have just described, on the one hand, and on the other hand the militaristic oligarchy established by the landlords in Sparta. Sparta was an unfortunate experiment in militarism and landlordism. It will be worth while to observe how the experiment began, and how it resulted.

The Dorians in Sparta. — In the southern tip of the Greek Peninsula there is a fertile valley, through which flows the swift Eurotas, and around which rise snow-capped mountain ranges, picturesquely enclosing the rich plain like a walled garden. This was the land of Laconia or Lacedæmon, over which King Menelaus had ruled in splendor during the Homeric Age, and from which Paris was said to have eloped with the most beautiful of all women. After the Trojan War, when the Dorians invaded Greece,

the palace of Menelaus and Helen was destroyed, and a considerable number of Dorian warriors settled down in the valley as conquerors and masters, dividing the best of the land amongst themselves and making the natives their servants and serfs. Their capital was Sparta, a new town, or rather a collection of villages, situated in the heart of the plain, on the Eurotas.

Overpopulation and Conquest. — As the Spartan aristocracy increased in numbers, more land was needed. Overpopulation was a condition that frequently arose among the aristocratic classes in Greek states, because an aristocrat required many broad acres to support him in proper style, and acres were scarce in a small country. Whereas other Greek states usually solved the problem by sending out colonists, to find estates in non-Greek lands, Sparta solved it by conquering her Greek neighbors. It was in the eighth century B.C. that the Spartan army invaded the neighboring land of Messenia. Desperately the Messenians fought to preserve their homes, their lands, and their freedom. Twenty years the war lasted. But in the end the Spartans won, and the best land of Messenia was appropriated by Spartans, while the former owners became serfs, paying half the produce of the land to Spartan landlords.

For a time culture and luxury flourished in the homes of the Dorian aristocrats of Sparta. Apparently these wealthy landlords enjoyed music and lyric poetry, dancing, artistic pottery, sculpture, and other refinements of life. The land was noted for its hunting, hospitality, and fair ladies.

The Messenian Revolt and Lycurgus. — A terrible danger, however, in the seventh century B.C., shook Spartan society to its foundations. The Messenian serfs and peasants revolted against their Spartan masters. Several independent states, jealous neighbors of Sparta, aided the rebels. By heroic efforts, the Spartan aristocrats crushed the revolt and repelled their enemies.

Henceforth, however, the fear of peasant revolts haunted the Spartans, and to safeguard their own position they adopted a series of laws that transformed their whole civilization. In later ages, they said that these laws were the work of a wise lawgiver, Lycurgus (lī-kûr′gŭs), who based the new constitution of his coun-

try on the institutions he had observed in Crete. It is quite possible that Sparta did imitate Crete, which was also ruled by a Dorian aristocracy; but the story of Lycurgus may be a myth.

Spartan Government. — By the "good laws" (*Eunomia*) which were adopted after the Messenian revolt and shortly before 600 B.C., the Spartans were divided into five geographical divisions, instead of three hereditary tribes as in the past. Each division was really a military district, providing one regiment for the army. The government was a kingdom in form, but an oligarchy in fact. Instead of having one king, Sparta had two kings, who checked each other to some extent. The kings offered public sacrifice to the gods and acted as judges in certain cases, but their chief importance was as generals of the army in time of war. All legislative proposals were discussed first in the Senate (*Gerousia*), consisting of the two kings and twenty-eight old men, all over sixty years of age, chosen from among the leading noble families. After the Senate had approved a measure, it was referred to the Assembly (*Apella*) of all the peers (that is, the members of the upper class who had full citizenship). But the chief power, in practice, was wielded by a Board of Supervisors (*Ephors*), five men elected annually by the Assembly to superintend the administration of the government.

Military Training; the Peers. — The most interesting feature of the Spartan reforms, without question, was the system of military training for the aristocracy. When a baby was born in an aristocratic family, government officials decided whether the infant was healthy, vigorous, and well formed; if it was weak or deformed, it was taken up into a mountain and left there to die. By such methods the Spartans hoped to weed out the weak, and breed a strong and manly race of warriors. Seven years a mother was allowed to have charge of her child. Then, if the child was a boy, he was sent to a camp where he slept on rushes, lived in the open, gained strength by athletic games, cooked his own food, and grew into hardy manhood under the charge of public officials. Boys were encouraged to steal food and sweets, because stealing was supposed to develop daring and cunning. Once a year the boys were cruelly flogged, to test their ability to endure pain. At

twenty, those who survived became soldiers and citizens, and each joined a sort of fraternity or mess-club, consisting of about fifteen shldiers who ate together. Each member contributed his share of barley, pork, cheese, wine, and figs to provide the simple, coarse meals of the club. The soldier was forbidden to engage in trade or industry or to own gold or silver money. War was his only profession. A man had no real home and rarely saw his wife, for he ate and slept in camp or barracks. Home, love, culture — all was sacrificed for the sake of military efficiency. Even the girls were put through a course of athletic training, so that they might have physical strength to transmit to their children.

This discipline applied only to the upper class, about one tenth or one twentieth of the population. To be a peer or citizen, one had to satisfy three requirements: (1) he must be the son of a peer; (2) he must have had the full course of military training; (3) he must belong to an army mess-club and live in the barracks until he was thirty years old. The five thousand peers really formed a standing army of unequalled discipline. Military service lasted from a man's twentieth to his sixtieth year.

The Helots. — This military machine was supported by the common people or serfs, who were generally known as *helots* (hĕl′ŏts). Each Spartan peer owned a large estate or farm, on which the farm work was done by helots, who delivered half their crops to the Spartan landlord. The helots had no choice; they could not move away; they must stay and work on the farm. There was a law which forbade the landlord to sell or free his helots. There was a secret police force, to murder any helot suspected of rebelliousness. In war, the helots were drafted to pull the heavy oars in the warships, or to accompany the Spartan troops as laborers; sometimes they took part in battle, using slings and spears, but they had no heavy armor.

The Periœci. — In the heart of Lacedæmon there were no cities, but only farms cultivated by helots for the peers who lived in the barracks at the capital, Sparta. Around the outskirts of the country, however, in the lands not appropriated for Spartan estates, there were about a hundred towns whose inhabitants were called *periœci* (pĕr-ĭ-ē′sī), meaning "those who dwell around"

(that is, "neighbors"). They formed a protecting border zone, separating the helot population from the outside world. The periœci were not serfs, like the helots, but were free to engage in agriculture, commerce, or manufacturing, as they pleased. The business life of the country was in their hands. They mined the iron ores found in the mountains, and wrought iron into helmets and swords; they conducted what little foreign commerce there was. Unlike the Spartan peers, the periœci could own gold and silver, and not a few of them became wealthy. In politics, however, they had very little voice, except as regards the local affairs in their own towns. No office in the central government was open to them. Only Spartan peers could sit in the Assembly. The chief towns of the periœci were under Spartan governors, and paid tribute to the government. In war, the periœci often served as heavy-armed infantry, although they could hardly compare with the Spartans for efficiency.

Effect on Civilization. — Such was the system that made Sparta the chief military power in Greece and made the name "Spartan" a synonym for rigid discipline and willingness to endure any pain or hardship. While other Greek states were enjoying the luxuries and pleasures that came with the growth of trade, industry, and art, the Spartans grimly endured their self-imposed discipline, their uncomfortable barracks and coarse food, hardening their bodies and souls not only against luxury, but also against art, and against the natural bonds of love and family that make life worth living. Some poetry they had, to arouse courage and patriotism. Their ideal was expressed by the poet Tyrtæus clearly enough: "A noble thing it is to die a valiant man, falling in the front line of warriors, in battle for the fatherland." But Sparta had nothing to contribute to Greek art or Greek civilization. Nor, as one Spartan king proudly boasted, did Sparta wish to learn anything from other states. In the long run, the Spartan system led to stagnation, immorality, and the decay of Spartan society.

The Peloponnesian League. — Before the collapse came, however, Sparta had her period of military power and conquests. The old city of Argos, which had once been the leading power in the

ANCIENT GREECE



(FOR REFERENCE)

peninsula, was defeated, thrust down into second place, and despoiled of several provinces. From the Arcadians, who held the land north of Lacedæmon, Sparta attempted to conquer the rich plain of Tegea, but so stubborn was the resistance of the Arcadians that Sparta altered her policy. Instead of conquering, she now sought to make allies of her neighbors. As oligarchical governments would be most likely to be loyal to the Spartan oligarchy, the Spartans made it a policy to expel tyrants from other Greek states, and to install friendly oligarchies. By the end of the sixth century, Sparta had treaties of alliance with all the states in the Peloponnesus (pĕl′ŏ-pŏ-nē′sŭs, the peninsula south of the Gulf of Corinth) except Achæa and Argos. The island of Ægina was also her ally. This group of allied states, including most of southern Greece, under the military leadership of Sparta, was known as the Peloponnesian (pĕl′ŏ-pŏ-nē′shăn) League.

Thessaly a Northern Sparta. — The only serious rival of the Peloponnesian League, at this time, was Thessaly. Thessaly was to northern Greece what Sparta was to the south. The Thessalian aristocracy owned the largest and richest plain in all Greece. Thessaly, too, had her league of allies. The Amphictyonic (ăm-fĭk-tĭ-ŏn′ĭk) League (League of Neighbors) of which Thessaly was the head included Doris, Locris, Phocis, Bœotia (bē-ō′shĭ-ȧ), and Eubœa, besides six other states that were under Thessaly's control. Like Sparta, Thessaly was ruled by a conservative aristocracy of serf-owning landlords, and like Sparta she contributed little to the civilization that we now regard as the glory of ancient Greece. Thessaly's cavalry was better than her culture.

The Athenian City-State

Disunity of Greece. — So numerous were the petty states into which ancient Greece was divided that it is impossible in this book to follow the fortunes of them all. Perhaps the character of the country, broken up by rugged, rocky mountains into tiny patches of plain and isolated valleys, may help to explain the disunity of ancient Greece. Yet it should be remembered that these mountains do not prevent the existence of a united Greece to-day. Not geography alone, but Greek ideals must be taken into account.

And the small city-state was one of the most cherished ideals of the ancient Greeks.

The City-State Ideal. — One of the greatest Greek philosophers wrote that the ideal state should include only as many people as could be gathered together in one place within earshot of a single orator. Other ancient Greek writers agreed with him in praising the state in which all citizens could meet and learn to know each other, participate in civic and religious ceremonies, attend the public theater, take pride in the city's public buildings and temples, and love their city with a devotion that would make them ready to die gladly in her defense.

The typical city clustered around a hill, and for a very simple reason. In early ages, the hilltop was crowned with a walled citadel, in which the citizens could defy invaders or enemies. Such a citadel or hilltop fortress was called a *polis* (pō′lĭs, whence are derived our words "politics" and "polite"). Originally it contained only a king's palace, a temple, and the homes of the king's chief followers. Gradually a village grew up, nestling about the foot of the hill, and the walls were enlarged, and the *polis* grew into a city, while the hilltop was given the name *acropolis* (*ȧ*-krŏp′ŏ-lĭs, "top of the city") and beautified with marble temples. The *polis*, or city, was the center of Greek social, intellectual and political life. The Greek state was literally a city-state, for the typical state included only one city with two or three hundred square miles of farm lands around it. From the acropolis of his city, the citizen could see the whole state, the whole country; only a few city-states had a radius of more than ten miles.

The city-state was exclusive, too, as well as small. Usually citizenship was hereditary, and aliens were forbidden to marry into the citizen class, or to hold land, or to take part in the religious activities of the city. Citizenship was a proud privilege. And each city looked to some particular god or goddess as its special patron and protector: so Hera guarded Argos, Apollo protected Apollonia, and the gray-eyed warrior-maid Athena, with spear and helmet, kept watch over the welfare of Athens.

Athens in Early Times. — Of all the ancient Greek city-states the one that contributed most to the enrichment of human life was

Athens. In its early days, Athens was no more than a citadel or castle built on a rugged hillock (the present Acropolis) in Attica. In some respects it was not a very promising region. The plains round about contained some fertile soil, to be sure, but much of the country was rocky, barren, and ill-watered. Yet it had its advantages. The very lack of rain gave the Athenians a dry, bracing climate and a clear atmosphere in which the picturesque outlines and colors of the hills stood out in vivid beauty. Moreover, near Athens the finest clay in all Greece waited for potters to fashion it into artistic vases, and the white marble of Pentelicus was there for the chisel, while in the mountains of Attica lay some of the richest silver and lead mines of Greece as well as veins of iron and zinc. Besides, only a few miles distant was a broad bay that would some day become a bustling commercial harbor.

The people were of mixed race, as most ancient "Greeks" were. They were usually regarded, however, as belonging to the Ionian branch of the Greek nationality, because they spoke a dialect closely resembling that of the Ionian cities across the Ægean.

Unification of Attica. — In the early period of Greek history, before the eighth century, Athens was only one, though the chief, of a dozen small city-states in the land of Attica. As Attica is only a thousand square miles in extent, less than thirty miles broad and less than sixty long, these petty states could not have averaged a hundred square miles in area. Not until they were united could Athens assume much importance. Their union was completed some time before 700 B.C., and their nobles came to live in Athens as Athenian citizens.

Athens in Seventh Century B.C. — Though considerably larger than the average city-state, Athens in the seventh century B.C. was relatively poor, weak, and inglorious. It was a country of poverty-stricken peasants raising scanty crops on a dry, thin soil, and of quarrelsome aristocrats engaged in murderous feuds. The mines were not yet being worked to any extent. Athens took no part in the colonial expansion of the eighth and seventh centuries, and probably shared little in the commercial development of the period. Athenian pottery of this time was decorated with pictures of funeral processions, warriors and chariots, ships and naval battles,

and it is clear that Athens did have some trade with Ionia, across the Ægean; but the Athenians had not begun to export fine pottery in any quantity. In many respects Athens was far inferior to such cities as Miletus, Mytilene, or Corinth.

Government. — Like most ancient states, Athens was at first ruled by a king. Gradually, however, the king's power was taken away from him by the nobles, who were the big landowners in the cauntry and were considered as forming a higher social class than the rest of the population.

By the seventh century B.C. the government had become an aristocracy — a government by the nobles. The highest officials of the government were the nine members of the Board of *Archons* (är′kŏnz). One of these, the Chief Archon, acted as governor in time of peace; another, the Polemarch (pŏl′ē-märk), took command in time of war; a third was called King, but had little authority; and the six others were judges. All the Archons were noblemen, elected by the nobles. At first they had been elected for life; then the term had been shortened to ten years; and finally, in the seventh century, it was reduced to one year. After holding the archonship a year, the ex-archons became life-members of the Council of the *Areopagus* (ăr′ē-op′*ā*-gŭs), a body which had great influence because it consisted of the most powerful nobles. This Council had the right to call any citizen to account for breaking the laws or trying to overthrow the government.

Under the rule of the nobles, the poorer classes of ordinary farmers and workingmen were oppressed and denied any voice in the government. As a result, the lower classes grew increasingly discontented, and demanded reforms.

Draco's Law Code. — The laws of Athens were unwritten customs interpreted by the nobles, until an Archon named Draco (drā′kō) put them into writing in the year 621 B.C. Draco's code was extremely harsh, providing the death penalty for nearly every kind of crime, as most ancient law codes did. Nevertheless, it was a step toward justice and democracy, because it allowed the common people to know what the laws were. In later times, Draco's laws were revised and the penalties were made less severe.

It is said that Draco also extended political rights to every citizen who could buy a spear, a sword, and a suit of armor in order to serve in the army as a heavy-armed soldier or hoplite (hŏp′līt); but very little is known about this measure. The story is told that in their gratitude toward Draco the people flung their caps and cloaks at him and the too popular reformer was accidentally suffocated.

Economic Crisis Caused by Coinage and Commerce. — By the beginning of the sixth century B.C., Athens was suffering from acute economic growing-pains. Money had come into circulation (the coins being those of Ægina), and the idea that "money makes the man" was creating grave problems. Athenian potters were beginning to export their vases and jars of fine clay. Athenian ships were sailing to Egypt, to Cyprus, to the Black Sea, and bringing home cargoes of grain from Scythia (southern Russia), handsome woollen cloaks from Miletus, bronzeware from Chalcis, choice cups and vases from Corinth, and many other luxuries for the rich nobility. Wine and olive oil were becoming important products of Athens.

While the rich grew more luxurious, the ordinary farmer groaned. The importation of grain lowered the value of his crops, and the exactions of luxury-loving landlords doubtless added to his burdens. In hard times, thousands of farmers borrowed money at exorbitant interest and pledged their land as security. When a man failed to repay a loan, and lost his land, he became a tenant, paying five-sixths of his crops as rent. Some farmers got into such dire straits that they mortgaged themselves or their children, and became debt-slaves.

Solon's Reforms. — It was Solon (sō′lŏn) who brought the remedy for this situation. Having won popularity as a military leader by conquering the island of Salamis, and as a statesman by his wisdom in dealing with an outbreak of mob violence, Solon was elected Archon in 594 B.C. A wealthy man himself, he nevertheless sympathized with the poor, and desired to see fair play.

Abolition of Debt-Slavery. — He must have had extraordinary courage, for he dared at one blow to emancipate all debt-slaves, to cancel all mortgages on land, and to forbid debt-slavery in the

future. "After long years of bondage," he said, "Athens is free." Yet he would not go to the extreme of dividing the estates of the noblemen to satisfy the desires of the poor. He believed in reform, but he was neither a democrat nor a socialist. The common people will obey their rulers best, he declared, if there is neither too much liberty nor too much oppression.

Constitutional Reforms. — This moderate attitude was clearly revealed in the new constitution which Solon gave Athens. The Board of *Archons* continued to be the chief administrative officials, and the Council of the *Areopagus* remained as an aristocratic body, a sort of supreme court having the right to call any citizen to account for violation of the laws. There was also an *Assembly* consisting of all citizens, including even the poor; and this Assembly was given the right to elect the Archons and to pass new laws. In addition, Solon created a *Council of 400*, whose members he chose for life, to pass on all proposed laws before they were submitted to the Assembly. Finally, he created new law courts or *juries*, to which all citizens were admitted on terms of equality.

These reforms admitted the common people to a small share of political rights, but left most of the power in the hands of the rich and high-born men who composed the Board of Archons, the Council of the Areopagus, and the Council of 400. Only men who owned land enough to produce "500 measures" of grain, oil, or wine a year could be elected as Archons; we may calculate that such men would have to own more than seventy-five acres of fertile grainfields, not including pasture and woodland. And no one could hold any public office at all who did not have an income of at least "200 measures," which meant having a farm of at least ten acres of grainfields or the equivalent in olive orchards or vineyards.

All citizens were divided into *four classes*, based on their incomes. The highest were the "500 measure men." Next came the "knights," who had 300 measures and could afford to serve at their own expense in the cavalry of the army. Third came the "yoke-men," the men who ploughed their small farms with a yoke of oxen and had an income of from 200 to 300 measures; these served in the infantry as heavily armored spearmen or hop-

lites. A citizen whose income was less than 200 measures had to serve as a light-armed soldier and was debarred from government offices; he was a "Thete," a member of the fourth class.

Encouragement of Business. — To encourage trade and industry, Solon offered Athenian citizenship to any skilled workingmen who settled in Attica. This measure was designed particularly to attract foreign potters to Athens. Corporations were authorized to engage in business. Solon established a mint to coin Athenian money, knowing that Athens with her own coinage could extend her foreign trade. Yet despite his desire to promote trade he remembered the poor, and in order to keep the cost of living down he forbade the export of grain and other crops, with the exception of olive oil, which was plentiful.

Solon's Retirement. — Solon's friends urged him to make himself tyrant of Athens, but they misunderstood his character. His work over, he made the people promise to obey the laws till he should return, and then went away for ten years — a hard thing for any patriotic Greek to do. In his travels he is said to have visited Crœsus, the rich King of Lydia, and made to that monarch the famous remark, "Call no man happy until he is dead." Even at the end of life, disappointments may come. And a grievous disappointment was in store for Solon himself, for when he returned to Athens he found the city in a tumult of party conflicts, and he lived to see a tyrant usurp supreme power.

Parties in Athens. — The tyrant was Pisistratus (pĭ-sĭs′trȧ-tŭs). He found Athens divided between the "Shore" party, which included sailors, fishermen, potters, and other city workmen, and the "Plain," the party of the rich noblemen who owned the best farms. Pisistratus made himself the leader of a third party, the "Hills," by promising land to the discontented shepherds, herdsmen, and poorer farmers who worked in the hilly parts of Attica. Boldly he seized the Acropolis, with the intention of making himself absolute ruler or tyrant. But Plain and Shore united to drive him out. Yet he returned, riding in a chariot, so the story goes, with a woman dressed as Athena, so that the people would believe the goddess herself was escorting him back. Again he was expelled, this time for ten years, but he made good use of his

exile by acquiring valuable silver mines in Macedonia, and, with his wealth, hiring a force of foreign soldiers.

Dictatorship of Pisistratus. — With foreign troops he once more invaded Athens and made himself tyrant, this time to rule for almost twenty years (546–527 B.C.), for he brought barbarian (Scythian) archers to overawe the city. Nevertheless his rule was no tyranny in our sense of the word. He respected the old institutions of government but saw to it that his friends were elected to office. And he did much for the people.

For his own party, the Hills, he divided the estates of nobles who had been killed in the fighting, or who had been exiled. Many poor men received small farms. He encouraged agriculture in many ways. Olive-growing increased rapidly as olive oil was exported in large quantities. The potters, who made the jars in which wine and oil were shipped, found their trade flourishing.

Other workmen of the Shore were given employment in the construction of public buildings. The limestone temple of Athena on the Acropolis was stuccoed and painted in bright colors, chiefly red and blue, and a colonnade was built around it. A huge temple was started in honor of Zeus. For the first time, the Athenians began to import the beautiful marble of the island of Paros.

While workmen were given employment, merchants were pleased by the new and beautiful currency which was minted of the silver obtained from the ruler's foreign mines, as well as from the mines in Attica, which were now being worked. The new coins, stamped with the head of Athena on one side and the Athenian owl on the other, did a great deal to promote the trade and prestige of Athens.

Popular Religious Festivals and Mysteries. — The tyrant sought to win popular favor also by increasing the splendor of religious ceremonies and festivals. Every four years there was a great celebration called the Greater Panathenæa, with races, dancing, athletic sports, and public recitations of Homer's epics. A new festival was the Dionysia (dī′ŏ-nĭsh′ĭ-*a*), in honor of the god Dionysus (dī-ŏ-nī′s*ŭ*s). Dionysus, it may be explained, was a god who had supposedly been torn to pieces by Titans, but reborn. In him, his worshippers saw a symbol of the mystery of death and life, and a hope of future life. With Dionysus was

associated Orpheus (ôr′fūs), the divinely sweet musician, who was reputed to have been the founder of a religious sect which believed the soul was reborn again and again until it achieved perfect purity and divinity. The connection with Dionysus is obvious. Demeter (dē-mē′tēr), too, the goddess of fertility, seemed to represent the same idea, for each year Pluto, god of the dead, took



THEATER OF DIONYSUS AT ATHENS

This theater, on the slopes of the Athenian Acropolis, was first built with wooden seats and stage; it was rebuilt in stone in the fifth century B.C. It held 14,000 spectators.

her daughter Persephone (pẽr-sĕf′ó-nē) to the underworld for six months, and each year Demeter received Persephone back into life.

Eleusinian Mysteries. — Through all these myths runs the idea of death and rebirth, of sin and purification. Many of the common people in Greece became worshippers of Dionysus and Demeter, and followers of Orpheus. Once a year pilgrims from Athens

thronged to Eleusis (ĕ-lū′sĭs) by the Sacred Road to be initiated into the so-called Eleusinian (ĕl-ū-sĭn′ĭ-ăn) mysteries. After being purified by bathing in the sea, worshippers were "initiated" by being permitted to witness a sort of pageant and to behold various sacred objects, about which the greatest secrecy was maintained. But we know at least that the Eleusinian mysteries were concerned with Demeter and Persephone, with Dionysus and Orpheus, with the mystery of life and death and rebirth.

Social Influence of Dionysian Religion. — The encouragement of the Eleusinian mysteries by Pisistratus and his establishment of the festival in honor of Dionysus had important results. The worship of the other gods[1] was to a considerable extent bound up with membership in noble families and clans or with particular cities, but the Dionysian religion was more democratic and helped break down the spirit of aristocracy and localism. In the second place, this religion tended to stimulate thinking about the nature of life and death and righteousness. Thirdly, the celebrations of Dionysus included choral singing and dialogues, which gradually developed into the earliest Greek drama. Thespis, who lived at the court of Pisistratus, is regarded as the first Greek dramatist.

The Tyranny after Pisistratus. — The two sons of Pisistratus as joint rulers continued his policy of building temples, holding magnificent festivals, and fostering the economic prosperity of the country. They built a subterranean aqueduct to supply the growing city with pure water. They constructed good roads, all leading to Athens. To their court came famous artists, especially sculptors, from the cultured cities of Ionia, and the most famous poets of the age (notably Anacreon and Simonides).

End of the Tyranny. — Yet there was some opposition. After one of the brothers had been assassinated, the other felt it necessary to disarm Athens, and rely on hired foreign soldiers. Moreover, an exiled family of nobles plotted and planned to restore aristocracy in Athens with the help of other states. Sparta, whose policy it was to oust tyrants and install oligarchies, finally decided to aid the exiles. The priests of Apollo at Delphi, who pretended to give the god's answers to questions, repeatedly told the Spartans,

[1] See pp. 129–130, 148.

when they consulted the oracle about other matters, "First free Athens." And Sparta sent her matchless army against Athens. The tyrant was besieged on the Acropolis. Perhaps he might have held out, but his children were captured, and to save them he agreed to leave the city (510 B.C.).

Spartan Intervention. — After the fall of the tyrants, the exiled aristocrats returned and came into their own, while the supporters of the former tyrants were disfranchised. Yet so great was the opposition that the Spartan king again led his troops to Athens to uphold the aristocrats. The people of Athens, however, rose in arms and besieged the Spartans on the Acropolis until their king agreed to withdraw from the city.

Cleisthenes' Reforms. — The skillful politician who had led the "Shore" party against aristocrats and Spartans was Cleisthenes (klīs'thĕ-nēz). His enthusiastic followers now made him lawgiver (*thesmothete*) with full powers. And Cleisthenes proceeded to carry out five remarkable reforms, which may well entitle him to honor as the father of Greek democracy.

1. *Extension of Citizenship.* — Up to this time citizenship had been limited to members of the four ancient "tribes," which consisted of descendants of the early settlers of Attica. Numerous poor people, immigrants, freed slaves, and their descendants had not been members of a tribe, and had therefore been without any political rights. Cleisthenes enrolled these people as citizens and made them members of the new tribes which he created.

2. *New Tribes.* — In place of the four ancient tribes, which had been very exclusive and had been largely under the leadership of noble families, Cleisthenes created ten new tribes and made these new tribes very important both in the government and in the army organization. By including in each of the ten new tribes a group of urban districts in the Shore, a group of farming districts in the Plain, and a group of poorer farming districts in the Hills, Cleisthenes cleverly destroyed the old spirit of hostility between Shore, Plain, and Hills, and at the same time made his new tribes less likely to be controlled by the nobles.

3. *The Council of 500.* Solon's aristocratic Council of 400 rich men chosen for life was transformed into a more democratic Coun-

cil of 500, the members of which were chosen for only one year. In the new Council each of the ten tribes had 50 representatives, chosen by lot from a list of candidates nominated by local elections in the wards or townships. As the term was only a year, and only two terms were permitted in a lifetime, we may estimate that in a period of twenty years seven or eight thousand citizens — one man out of every three or four — would have served a term

GATE OF THE MARKET PLACE IN ATHENS

on the Council. Since the Council now had a good deal of executive power, besides having the right to pass on all new laws before they were submitted to the Assembly, it was highly important that its membership was made more democratic by Cleisthenes. For its meetings Cleisthenes built a hall near the Market Place at the very center of the city's everyday life.

Committee System. — The duties of the Council were to prepare legislation for approval by the Assembly, and to conduct the

administration from day to day. As the Council was rather large for this purpose, and few citizens could afford to give a whole year of their time without pay, the members were grouped into ten committees of fifty members each, and each committee transacted the business of government for thirty-six days.

4. *The Generals.* — Cleisthenes also reorganized the army, dividing it into ten regiments, one for each tribe, and putting each regiment under the command of an elected General or "Strategos" (strȧ-tē'gŏs). As wars were frequent, the ten Generals held an important place in the life of the state, and in course of time they became even more influential than the Archons.

5. *Ostracism.* — The fifth reform was a strange one. It was the peculiar custom known as ostracism (ŏs'trȧ-sĭz'm), invented by Cleisthenes. Once a year the Assembly could hold a special meeting, provided six thousand citizens attended and voted at the meeting. On that occasion each voter wrote the name of some person on a piece of broken pottery (*ostrakon*). Then these pieces were collected and the votes counted. The citizen who received the largest number of votes was exiled for ten years. The custom may seem strange, but there was a real reason for it. There was still danger that some prominent politician might seek to usurp power as a tyrant. Political rivalry had very recently led to civil war and Spartan invasions. Ostracism enabled the people to exile any man suspected of cherishing the desire to become a second Pisistratus. Ostracism was intended as a substitute for civil war.

Importance of the Assembly. — The Assembly, which included all citizens and met once in ten days on the Pnyx (nĭks) Hill, was now a larger body, since it included the new citizens. It had the old right to vote on all laws, and the new right to ostracize dangerous politicians. Increasingly it became important for political leaders to have the support of a majority in the Assembly.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Explain why an important place in the history of civilization should be given to "classical" Greek civilization.
2. What did the Greeks inherit from earlier civilizations?

3. To what extent do the Homeric poems afford material for history? When were they composed? Do they portray events and conditions in Homer's own lifetime?

4. Compare the social and political conditions portrayed by Homer with the condition of the Aryans in India as described by the Zend Avesta.

5. What was the effect of the Dorian invasions on Achæan civilization?

6. What was "Ionia"? Mention three important Ionian cities. What contributions did Ionia make to the progress of Greek art, architecture, philosophy, and business methods?

7. Describe the expansion of the Greek world in the period of colonization from 750 to 550 B.C., explaining the reasons for colonization, the economic effects, and the nature of the colonies. Which cities took leading parts in colonization? What regions were colonized?

8. Would it be fair to say that Greek "tyrants" were sometimes less oppressive than the aristocracies they overthrew? Compare the policies of Cypselus and Periander of Corinth with those of Pisistratus of Athens.

9. Summarize the laws by which militarism was fostered in Sparta. What were the effects of these laws on Spartan life?

10. How did the position of the helots differ from that of the periœci?

11. Contrast the government of Sparta, about the year 600 B.C., with that of Athens at the same date.

12. Do you consider the reforms of Draco, or those of Solon, or those of Cleisthenes, most important in the development of Athenian democracy? Give reasons for your answer.

13. How did the reforms of Solon and the dictatorship of Pisistratus promote the economic development of Athens?

14. Contrast the religion revealed in Homer's poems with the mystery-religion of Dionysus, Orpheus, and Eleusis. How did the latter affect the progress of Athenian democracy, philosophy, and literature?

15. What was meant by "ostracism"? Why was it introduced?

SPECIAL TOPICS

Mycenæan civilization. BOTSFORD, *Hellenic History*, ch. ii; BURY, *History of Greece*, 20–43; CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY, II, 450–467; GLOTZ, *Ægean Civilization*, 47–53.

Homer's account of the Trojan War. *The Iliad*, Book xvi; JAMES, *Our Hellenic Heritage*, I, 76–104; BURY, *History of Greece*, 44–49; CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY, II, 487–496.

Schliemann's excavations. JAMES, *Our Hellenic Heritage*, I, 105–131.

Social life in the Homeric Age. BOTSFORD, *Hellenic History*, 41–51; BOTSFORD AND SIHLER, *Hellenic Civilization*, 104–109 (14a and b).

Economic life in the Homeric Age. GLOTZ, *Ancient Greece at Work*, 7–47, 48–60.

Greek private life. VAN HOOK, *Greek Life and Thought*, 37–45; TUCKER, *Life in Ancient Athens*, 105–152; W. S. DAVIS, *A Day in Old Athens*.

Economic life in early Greek times. GLOTZ, *Ancient Greece at Work*, 73–86; BURY, *History of Greece*, 106–119.

Colonization and trade. GLOTZ, *Ancient Greece at Work*, 98–126.

Money and its effects. GLOTZ, *Ancient Greece at Work*, 61–72, 230–244, 325–331; CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY, IV, ch. v.

Greek colonization of Sicily and Italy. BURY, *History of Greece*, 93–106; BOTSFORD AND SIHLER, *Hellenic Civilization*, 118–130; CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY, III, 669–686.

Sparta. BOTSFORD, *Hellenic History*, ch. vi; FERGUSON, *Greek Imperialism*, 79–97; GLOTZ, *Ancient Greece at Work*, 87–97; BOTSFORD, *Source-Book of Ancient History*, 111–121.

Solon. HOPKINSON, *Greek Leaders*, 1–17; CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY, IV, 36–58.

Pisistratus the tyrant. BURY, *History of Greece*, 190–202; CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY, IV, 61–70.

Geographic environment of Athens. VAN HOOK, *Greek Life and Thought*, ch. iii.

Greek gods. JAMES, *Our Hellenic Heritage*, I, 35–58; BOTSFORD, *Source-Book of Ancient History*, 88–96.

Greek sports. VAN HOOK, *Greek Life and Thought*, 63–78; JAMES, *Our Hellenic Heritage*, I, 210–213; GARDINER, *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals*.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THE TEACHER

BOTSFORD, *Hellenic History*. J. B. BURY, *History of Greece*. CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY, II, chs. xvii–xxii; III, chs. xxi–xxvi; IV, chs. ii–vi, xiv–xvi. D. G. HOGARTH, *Ionia and the East*. HALL, *Ancient History of the Near East*. G. GLOTZ, *Ægean Civilization*. G. GLOTZ, *Ancient Greece at Work*. J. T. SHOTWELL, *History of History*, ch. xii. H. R. JAMES, *Our Hellenic Heritage*.

CONVENIENT SOURCE MATERIALS

BOTSFORD, *Source-Book of Ancient History*. BOTSFORD AND SIHLER, *Hellenic Civilization*. HOMER, *Iliad* (tr. by Lang, Leaf, and Myers) and *The Odyssey* (tr. by Butcher and Lang). HERODOTUS, *History*. PLUTARCH, *Lives* (particularly the Life of Solon, for this chapter). ARISTOTLE, *Constitution of Athens*.

CHAPTER VI

THE PERSIAN WAR AND THE TRIUMPH OF ATHENS

The Oriental Empire of the Persians

Contrasting Civilizations. — Before reaching the splendid climax of their civilization, the Greek city-states passed through an ordeal which profoundly affected their growth. That ordeal was a struggle for existence against the greatest military empire to which Western Asia had yet given birth.

The meaning of the struggle will not be clear unless we understand at the outset how the contending forces differed. The Greek city-states had borrowed the best that the older Cretan, Egyptian, and West-Asiatic civilizations had to offer, and had produced a combination that was new and promising, vigorous and young. At a time when the Egyptians were striving to pattern their art after the archaic fashions originated by their early ancestors, and when the Babylonians were devoutly poring over the records of their ancient glories, the Greeks, who did not yet have much of a past to worship, were making a future for themselves. Relatively free from the tyranny of the dead past, they were producing new and more beautiful forms of art and literature, new philosophies and science, and — in Athens — a new form of government, the democratic city-state. Above all, the Greeks cherished the ideal of the free city-state, as opposed to the ideal of world empire.

The Persians, like the Greeks, were heirs of the older civilizations.[1] For example, they adopted the old Babylonian-Assyrian cuneiform

[1] The Persians (or Iranians), like the Greeks, were an Aryan people or spoke an Aryan language. Their earlier history has been sketched in Chapter III, pp. 91–93.

writing, although they reduced the number of characters in use to 43, and used them to express the Persian rather than the Babylonian language.[1] They adopted the Babylonian form of architecture, erecting their buildings on large terraced mounds or platforms, but they substituted stone for brick and they built palaces and government offices instead of temples. A fire-altar rather than a temple was ordinarily sufficient for their religious worship. For their god Ahura Mazda they borrowed the symbol of the winged sun-disk, which the Assyrians had used for their god Ashur. Like the Assyrians, they set at the stately entrances of their palaces colossal stone figures of a winged bull with human face. From Egypt, too, the Persians borrowed many things. Like Egyptian Pharaohs the Persian Kings hewed out great rock sepulchers for themselves. And like the Egyptians and Greeks, rather than the Babylonians, the Persians used a large number of columns in their buildings, although they made their columns more slender and set them farther apart than did the Egyptians and Greeks.

Assyrian Sculpture

These facts in themselves may be unimportant, but they are mentioned to illustrate the larger fact that Persian civilization, like Greek civilization, was a combination of other and older civilizations. Nevertheless, the Persian combination was different and less valuable. It used cuneiform instead of the western alphabet; it drew artistic inspiration chiefly from the Assyrian rather than from the more beautiful art of Egypt; it was inferior in literature; and it took over from the Assyrians the oriental ideal of military empire as opposed to the Greek ideal of the free city-state.

Persia's Military Imperialism. — The Persians, like many other military nations in history, had a militarist aristocracy that scorned industry and commerce. Their method of gaining wealth

[1] For communicating with their conquered provinces in Syria and Asia Minor they used the Aramaic (Semitic) language and alphabet.

and luxury was conquest rather than commerce. Conquest brought them plunder and tribute from subject peoples, while it satisfied also their thirst for honor and glory. Such a military aristocracy, devoting itself to hunting, military drill, and war, and living by plunder and tribute, is less likely than a commercial city such as Miletus or Athens to make progress in science, art, literature, and free government.

As conquerors and empire-builders the Persians were far superior to their forerunners. The Egyptians with their chariots and bronze weapons had conquered Nubia and Syria for a time, but were usually content to levy tribute on subject princes, and had little love for war. The Assyrians with their arrows and iron spears and swords, and with their well-organized armies of infantry, chariotry, and cavalry, had conquered most of Western Asia and Egypt; they had outdone the Egyptians by definitely annexing conquered territories, placing these under the administration of Assyrian governors, and crushing opposition either by bloody cruelties or by transplanting people wholesale from one part of the empire to another. The Medes, in the northwestern part of the Iranian plateau, had learned the arts of war and conquest from Assyria, and had improved on Assyrian cavalry methods. Finally, the Persians, kinsmen of the Medes, in the southern part of the Iranian plateau, took over both the Empire and the methods of the Medes. To these methods the Persians owed much, but not all, of their success.

Their victories and the lasting character of their Empire were due also to several other facts. For one thing, the Persians themselves were a race of hardy mountaineers, unequalled horsemen and brave warriors, not yet weakened by over-indulgence in luxury. The Persians always formed the backbone of the army, no matter how many additional troops might be raised from conquered peoples. A second reason for Persian success may be found in the fact that the Persians not only adopted but improved the old Assyrian methods of ruling conquered provinces and preventing rebellions.

Cyrus Founds the Persian Empire. — How Persia came into conflict with the Greeks will become clear if we review the steps in

the expansion of the Persian Empire. The Empire was founded by Cyrus the Great (558–529 B.C.), who united Media with Persia in the year 549 B.C. The annexation of Media gave him a claim to Armenia and the eastern half of Anatolia, which had been part of the Median empire.[1] The efforts of Cyrus to make good this claim led to the next great step, the conquest of Lydia and Ionia in western Asia Minor, during the years 546–540 B.C.

PERSIAN SCULPTURE AT PERSEPOLIS

Cyrus Defeats Crœsus of Lydia. — At this time most of Asia Minor, from the Ægean coast on the west to the Halys (hā′lĭs) River on the east, was embraced in a kingdom called Lydia, under the rule of King Crœsus (560–546 B.C.), whose wealth and pride and subsequent downfall have been made famous by ancient Greek writers. Crœsus increased his wealth by completing the conquest of the Greek city-states — the Ionian, Æolian, and Dorian cities — on the Asiatic coast of the Ægean, and compelling them to pay tribute to his treasury and furnish soldiers for his army. Then he turned eastward to extend his frontiers beyond the Halys River, by making war against Cyrus the Great, who claimed the lands east of the Halys.

Before attacking Cyrus, the Lydian King took care to form alliances with the other great powers — Egypt and Babylon. The Spartans promised to send their warships to his aid. He also consulted the Greek oracle at Delphi, from which he received the prophecy that if he marched against the Persians he would destroy a great Empire. The prophecy was true, but it was his own

[1] See page 92.

rather than the Persian Empire that he was to destroy. Nor did his allies aid him. His army was defeated by Cyrus, his kingdom was annexed by Persia, and his capital, the city of Sardis, became the headquarters for the Persian governor of western Asia Minor.

Conquest of Ionia. — The fall of Crœsus determined the fate of the Ionian and other Greek cities on the Anatolian coast, which had been tributary to him. Had these cities followed the advice of the statesman-philosopher Thales, and united, they might have resisted the Persians, but they remained disunited. One by one they were conquered. Several cities took to their ships and migrated overseas, rather than submit. But the larger number accepted Persian rule, paid tribute, and furnished their quotas of soldiers for the Persian army. Even so they retained much self-government. Each city was ruled by a tyrant, a Greek, who was selected by the Persians and was loyal to Persia.

Cyrus Master of Western Asia. — The conquest of Media had been the first step in Persia's expansion, and the annexation of Lydia and the Ionian cities was the second. The third step was taken by Cyrus in the years 540–539 B.C., when he invaded Babylonia, and captured the Babylonian king.[1] This victory gave him not only Mesopotamia, but also Syria and Palestine, and the Phœnician cities with their warships. Proudly he assumed the title, "King of Babylon, King of the Lands," and boasted that he received tribute from "all the kings dwelling in palaces in all the quarters of the earth, from the Upper to the Lower Sea, and all the kings of the West-Land dwelling in tents." In truth he was ruler of all the lands from the Persian Gulf to the Caspian, Black, Ægean, and Mediterranean seas. The ruler of such an extensive empire may well be termed an Emperor.

Persian Conquest of Egypt. — The next step was, naturally, to seize Egypt. The land of the Nile had been enjoying a period of revived prosperity and power, since it had thrown off Assyrian rule over a century earlier (651 B.C.). The Greeks had had much to do with the revival of Egypt. Their trade, in grain, oil, and wine, had brought prosperity. Their soldiers, employed as mercenaries, formed the army of the Pharaoh. With restored energy,

[1] See page 91.

Egypt had again become a military power. She had allied herself with Crœsus, although she had not helped him against the Persians. For that alliance, however, she was soon to be punished. Cyrus was killed in battle before he could undertake the task, but his son Cambyses (kăm-bī′sēz) fulfilled it. Raising a large army, with camels to carry water supplies across the deserts, he invaded Egypt, captured the proud city of Thebes, and had himself



TOMB OF CYRUS

Burial place of the founder of the Persian Empire. Built during his reign at Pasargadæ, about thirty miles northeast of Persepolis, the later capital of the Persian Empire.

crowned as Pharaoh of Egypt. Three years he remained on the Nile, endeavoring to enlarge his new province by adding Libya and northern Ethiopia.

The Persian Empire under Darius. — After Cambyses died (or perhaps committed suicide) on his return from Egypt, an ambitious prince named Darius (dȧ-rī′ŭs) enthroned himself, claiming to be King "by the grace of Ahura Mazda" and by the right of descent. But neither descent nor Ahura Mazda made him King, so much

as his own strong determination. At the outset he had to slay another claimant of the throne. Then he had to suppress one rebellion after another, in Media, in Babylon, in Armenia, and in other provinces. Suspecting the governor of Egypt of treason, he hurried to the Nile, put the governor to death, and had himself formally crowned as Pharaoh, with all the ancient Egyptian ceremonies.

Scythian Expedition. — The next year, he thought it necessary to lead a great expedition into the Balkan Peninsula, against the Scythian tribesmen who lived in the great plains north of the Black and Caspian seas. Crossing the Bosphorus on a bridge of ships constructed for him by a skilled Greek engineer, he marched northward through Thrace, crossed the Danube on another bridge of ships, and marched on into the country of the Scythians. The Scythians, however, simply retreated, with their cattle, instead of giving battle. At last he turned back, baffled, with the Scythians pouncing on his rear guards. Darius himself returned to Asia, but he left a Persian general to complete the conquest of Thrace, and his forces took possession of the Bosphorus to prevent barbarians in the future from crossing over into Asia from Thrace. The Persian Empire had made its first assault upon Europe. It already included the Greeks east of the Ægean, and it would next assail the Greeks to the west.

Extent of the Empire. — The Empire which was about to come to grips with the little Greek city-states was the greatest that the world had hitherto known. In Asia it stretched east as far as the Indus River (for Darius conquered the border provinces of India); northward it reached to the Aral Sea, the Caspian, the Caucasus Mountains, and the Black Sea; westward it extended through Syria to the Mediterranean and through Asia Minor to the Ægean. In Africa it included Egypt, together with Libya to the west and part of Ethiopia to the south of Egypt. In Europe it had Thrace.

Satrapies and Roads. — This vast realm Darius divided into twenty *satrapies* (provinces), each under a governor or *satrap* (sā′trăp) responsible to himself. Usually he selected men of royal or noble Persian blood to serve as satraps. Even then, he could not entirely trust them, but had to send out an official known as

"the King's Eye," often his son or his brother, to inspect the satrapies. The satrap was the chief administrative, judicial, and military authority in his province; he supervised the various local governments that were often allowed to continue in existence; and he saw to it that taxes were levied to pay the regular tribute to Persia.

To hold such an Empire together was not easy, in the days before telegraph and railroad had been invented. Ordinarily it would take three months for a man or an army to make the journey on foot from Sardis, in Asia Minor, to Susa, the capital, at the center of the Empire. But Darius established a system of roads leading out from Susa to the various provinces of the Empire. Along the roads were frequent road-houses, where messengers and fresh horses were ready to relay reports to, or orders from, Susa. When the King sent out an order, it was carried by relays of galloping horsemen, riding day and night along the King's roads. Such messengers could cover the distance of fifteen hundred miles from Susa to Sardis in a fortnight, or possibly even in one week, instead of three months. By the same roads travelled the King's inspectors, the reports from his satraps, and, when necessary, the King's armies. And by them travelled, too, the tribute-bearers.

Darius and other Persian Emperors did not attempt to Persianize their Empire; they did not attempt to force all their subjects to speak Persian, or to adopt the Persian religion. On the contrary, great pains were taken to conciliate the subject peoples, especially in religious matters. The King himself built temples and made royal gifts to the gods of Egypt and Babylon. He allowed the Jews to return to Palestine and gave funds for the rebuilding of the temple at Jerusalem.

Tribute. — What the Persians wanted was not to spread their religion or language, but to receive tribute. From Egypt they obtained an annual tribute of 700 talents, a little over a million dollars. India paid several times as much, in gold-dust. Altogether, the twenty satrapies contributed almost twenty million dollars a year. And that included only the royal tribute in gold and silver. There were also tributes, from various regions, in the form of horses, sheep, camels, ivory, and incense. There were

THE PERSIAN EMPIRE, ABOUT 500 B.C.

taxes, too, paid in the form of grain and other foodstuffs, for the support of the army and the officials. In the royal treasury an immense quantity of silver and gold, representing in our money perhaps one or two hundred million dollars, was accumulated as the King's reserve fund.

Army. — One other service the Persians demanded of their subjects — military service. Each province was to supply its quota of troops in war. But the generals were usually Persian noblemen, and the finest troops, the flower of the army, came from Persia itself, rather than from the subject provinces.

With their enormous empire, from which they drew both taxes and soldiers, the Persians may well have looked with scorn on the tiny Greek states, far off on the northwestern frontier. What is difficult for the historian to explain is how the Greeks dared to fight. It was a battle between David and Goliath.

The Greeks and the Persian Wars

The Ionian Revolt. — The conflict between the Greeks and the Persian Empire began in the reign of Darius, not long after the year 500 B.C., while Sparta was mistress of the Peloponnesian League, and Athens was experimenting with the new democratic reforms of Cleisthenes. But before Athens and Sparta took an active part, the struggle began in Ionia, across the Ægean.

Causes. — The first act in the drama was the Ionian Revolt of 499 B.C. The Ionian and other Greek cities along the Ægean coast of Asia Minor had submitted rather tamely to Persian conquest in the days of Cyrus and had remained submissively under the Persian yoke, paying tribute and providing soldiers, for two generations — over forty years. But in time they grew rebellious, for two reasons. First, there was a good deal of political opposition to the tyrants, whom the Persians had installed and maintained as rulers of the Greek cities. The merchant classes and workingmen desired democracy and were eager to overthrow their despotic tyrants. Second, the Ionian cities found that Persian rule interfered with their commercial and industrial prosperity.

Outbreak. — The outbreak came in 499 B.C., when Aristagoras

(ăr-ĭs-tăg′ō-rȧs), the tyrant of Miletus, granted to his city a free constitution, became the elected head of the government, and began a policy of helping other cities to depose their tyrants. That, of course, was an act of rebellion against Persia, for the tyrants were Persia's vassals.

Realizing that he would soon be engaged in war, Aristagoras wisely persuaded the Ionian cities to unite in a federation, with a federal coinage in which to pay their combined fleets. He also went to the Greek cities across the Ægean, to plead for aid. To the King of Sparta he is said to have offered a bribe of more than fifty thousand dollars, but in vain. Only from Athens and Eretria could he secure help — twenty warships from the former and five from the latter. Yet he dared attack Persia.

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

A Greek Horseman

An Ionian relief of the fourth century B.C.

Boldly enough the Ionian forces went up the Hermus River to Sardis, where the Persian satrap had his headquarters. By surprise they captured Sardis, and by accident burned it. Then they retreated, and the Athenian and Eretrian ships sailed home. The Ionians, however, continued hostilities. They even stirred up the Greeks in Cyprus to revolt and they destroyed a Phœnician fleet that was sent to punish Cyprus.

Treachery and Defeat. — The Ionians, however, could not remain united against Persia. Aristagoras, who had started the revolt, dishonorably migrated to Thrace, with a group of leading citizens from Miletus, hoping to gain wealth from the mines there and to escape Persia's vengeance. He met the fate he deserved, however, for he and his friends were massacred by the natives in Thrace. The same sort of treachery was displayed when the Ionians had to face a great fleet of several hundred warships which Persia had collected from her Phœnician and Egyptian subjects. In the midst of battle, the ships of two cities coolly hoisted their sails and deserted, leaving the others to suffer defeat.

Having destroyed Ionian sea-power, the Persians were now able to blockade and besiege Miletus, the pride of Greek Asia Minor. When the city fell, in 494 B.C., most of the men were butchered, and the rest of the population was transported to Mesopotamia. A similar fate befell some of the other cities. Such vengeance was more characteristic of the old Assyria than of the new Persia. As soon as he heard of it, Darius stopped the atrocities and sent his son-in-law to conciliate the recent rebels. He even allowed them to have democratic governments. Their vitality, however, had been destroyed, and their days of greatness and courage were done. Up to this time they had been the leaders in Greek civilization, but henceforth the leadership fell to Athens and other cities west of the Ægean.

Athens and Persia. — The ill-fated Ionian Revolt was the prelude to a Persian attack on Athens. There was more than one reason for war between Athens and Persia. Twenty Athenian ships had taken part in the Ionian raid on Sardis, and it was but natural that Persia should desire to punish Athens for that act of hostility. Moreover, the collapse of the revolt and the destruction of Miletus aroused deep sympathy in Athens, for the Athenians regarded the Ionians as their kinsmen. Indeed, when a drama called the "Capture of Miletus" was presented at Athens, the spectators "fell to weeping." In the third place, Hippias, the ex-tyrant of Athens, had solicited Persian support for his plans of reëstablishing himself as tyrant in Athens, and the Persians had informed Athens that Hippias must be restored. Consequently,

the followers of Hippias in Athens were pro-Persian, but the other parties became all the more hostile to Persia because they feared the restoration of the tyrant. Finally, an Athenian by the name of Miltiades (mĭl-tī′ȧ-dēz), who had possessed a principality in Thrace, and who had fled to Athens after the collapse of the Ionian Revolt, was very influential in urging Athens to prepare for war against Persia.

The First Persian Invasion. — The Persian King, Darius, realized that with a hostile Athens across the Ægean it would be difficult to keep Ionia in hand. Moreover, Hippias had doubtless told him that a strong party in Athens would welcome the restoration of the tyranny, even though Persia used force to accomplish it. Accordingly Darius sent a strong Persian force against Athens. Hippias accompanied the Persians.

Attack on Eubœa. — Instead of attacking Athens directly, the Persians landed on the island of Eubœa, which is separated from Attica by only a narrow channel or sound. The city of Eretria in Eubœa appealed to Athens for aid. Athens in turn sent the runner Philippides (or Pheidippides) with a plea for Spartan assistance. After running 150 miles in 48 hours, Philippides delivered his message, but the Spartans replied that they could not go to war until the full moon, because of an important religious festival.[1] The Athenians, however, sent their army of 10,000 heavy-armed hoplites (spearmen) and a considerable force of light-armed troops to aid Eretria.

The Peril to Athens. — While they were on the march, word came that another Persian army was landing at Marathon, on the coast of Attica itself. Speedily then the Athenian army changed its route, and hastened to meet the invaders at Marathon. Finding themselves outnumbered, the Athenians hesitated about attacking the Persians, until the tragic news arrived that Eretria had been burned and its people killed or deported. Now there was the danger that while one Persian army held the Athenians at Marathon, the other, having taken Eretria, might sail around Attica and assault the undefended city of Athens.

[1] This famous run by Philippides on the eve of the battle of Marathon is the origin of the idea of "marathon races."

Battle of Marathon. — Realizing this peril, Miltiades persuaded the Athenian commanders to give battle, and on September 21, 490 B.C., the Athenian hoplites advanced, running at double quick across the plain, through the hail of enemy arrows, until they could fight at close quarters, with the advantage their long spears and heavy metal armor gave them over the unarmored Persian bowmen and swordsmen. Armor, long spears, skillful generalship, and the desperate courage of men fighting for their homes and altars won the victory. The invaders fled to their ships, leaving 6400 Asiatics dead or dying on the bloody field. The Athenians had lost less than 200. But meanwhile the other Persian army, undefeated, was sailing in transports from Eretria to Athens, hoping to seize the city before the Athenian army had returned from Marathon. When they arrived, however, the Persians discovered that the Athenians had made the long march from Marathon, and were ready to give battle again. Disappointed, the Persians turned about face, and sailed back to Asia. Soon afterwards an army of Spartans arrived at Athens, too late to help, but in time to offer congratulations.

The Result. — Though Athens was justly proud of having defeated the renowned Persian army, the victory was not final. Darius, with the resources of all Western Asia and Egypt to draw on, was determined to send an even larger force against this troublesome Greek city. Death cut short the desire of Darius for vengeance, but his son Xerxes (zûrk′sēz) continued his policy.

The Armada of Xerxes. — Xerxes made his preparations on a vast scale. From all quarters of his empire he gathered together an army which the Greeks said amounted to almost two million men, but more probably it included about 180,000. The Phœnicians, the Egyptians, the recently conquered Ionians, and other subject peoples were required to furnish warships — 1207 according to Greek accounts, and over 700 according to a moderate modern estimate. Hundreds of ships were tied together to form a bridge by which the army could march across the Hellespont (Dardanelles). Circling around the northern end of the Ægean, the army and navy advanced against northern Greece. Not Persia alone, but all Western Asia and Egypt were represented in the over-

whelming invasion that threatened to blot out the puny cities in its path.

Naval Policy of Themistocles. — What preparations had the Greeks made to meet this peril? The leading politician in Athens at the time was Themistocles (thĕ-mĭs′tŏ-klēz), a man of exceptional shrewdness and energy. As the brains and spokesman of the merchants, overseas traders, and industrial workers at Athens, he advocated a policy of naval and commercial expansion. He therefore urged the Athenians to increase their navy rather than their army, as the best defense against Persia. His chief opponent, Aristides (ăr′ĭs-tī′dēz), a leader of the farmer party, insisted that Athens should remain a land-power, putting her reliance upon her army. Themistocles, however, managed to have Aristides ostracized.



THEMISTOCLES

With Aristides out of the way, Themistocles persuaded the Athenian Assembly to vote a naval appropriation of 100 talents of silver, which had been obtained from the rich silver mines in Attica, and which would ordinarily have been divided among the citizens as a sort of bonus. With that sum, two hundred triremes were to be built. A trireme, by the way, was a wooden warship about 130 feet long, rowed by 170 oarsmen, who were seated in three rows. With its projecting metal-covered beak, it could be used for ramming the enemy's ships; or if that did not succeed, the crew could use their spears and swords against the enemy crew. With two hundred triremes, Athens would rank as a first-class naval power.

Pan-Hellenic Alliance against Persia. — Furthermore, Themistocles used diplomacy to secure promises of support from other Greek states. Probably at his suggestion, Athens and Sparta organized a Hellenic League against the Persians, and held a congress of Greek states, at Corinth, to prepare plans for meeting the threatened Persian invasion. Sparta, as the strongest military power, naturally presided at the conference, and was given chief command over all the Greek forces. Besides Athens and Sparta, the members of the Peloponnesian League,[1] the cities of Bœotia, the aristocrats of Thessaly, and some others joined the League. But several states held aloof.

Greek Disunity. — The disunity of the Greeks should be emphasized and explained. Many Greeks felt that even if they yielded to Persia they would still have a large amount of self-government, and would merely have to pay tribute. In a number of cities there were political parties which actually desired Persian intervention, for the purpose of overthrowing the existing government. For example, the Athenian faction which wished to restore the tyrant Hippias had almost certainly been in treasonable communication with the Persians at the time of the battle of Marathon, and since then. Greek politicians seemed to feel that it was not particularly dishonorable to call in foreign aid in order to seize power themselves. In the decisive battles of the war the Greek allies had to contend with Greek traitors as well as Asiatic enemies.

The Battle of Thermopylæ. — It was treachery that occasioned the most tragic, and most gallant, episode in the war. As Xerxes advanced southward into Greece, with his armies and his fleet, the allies decided to make their chief stand at the Isthmus of Corinth, but they sent a small force of ten thousand men northward to meet and delay the invader at the pass of Thermopylæ (thēr-mŏp′ĭ-lē). For several days King Leonidas (lē-ŏn′ĭ-dȧs) of Sparta, with his ten thousand, held the pass against Persian attacks. But a Greek traitor showed the Persians a path by which they could fall upon Leonidas from the rear. Sending most of his troops to meet this menace, Leonidas kept with him 300 Spartan spearmen and some

[1] See p. 147.

1100 other Greeks, to withstand the main attack. Overpowered by sheer numbers, the fearless Spartans fought to the end, meeting death with a heroism that has won praise from that time (480 B.C.) to this.

Capture of Athens. — That same day, Xerxes learned that the Greek fleet, after giving battle to the Persian fleet near the Eubœan coast, had retreated southward. Triumphantly he advanced. Thebes and other cities in Bœotia promptly joined him and furnished troops to swell his ranks. What should Athens do? As the Spartan and other Peloponnesian armies were encamped on the Isthmus of Corinth, across which they had built a wall, and north of which they dared not venture, it would be worse than hopeless for the Athenian army alone to defend Athens. The oracle of Apollo at Delphi had advised the Athenians to trust her "wooden wall." Cleverly Themistocles interpreted these puzzling words to mean the wooden ships of the navy. He persuaded the Athenians to take to their ships, abandoning their country, and sending their families to nearby islands. So Xerxes found Attica deserted, except for a handful of heroes who had been left to defend the Athenian Acropolis with its sacred temples. This garrison was soon captured and executed, and the temple of Athena was given over to flames.

The Battle of Salamis. — With his army in Attica and his fleet nearby, Xerxes paused expecting further naval reinforcements. The Greek army was on the isthmus, while the Greek fleet was sheltered in the channel between the island of Salamis (*săl′ȧ-mĭs*) and the mainland. While the Greeks were debating whether to risk a naval battle or to wait for an invasion of the Peloponnesus, Themistocles threatened that if the fleet retreated he would desert the cause, and send the Athenian population to find a new home in Italy. He won the argument. Then he sent a faithful slave, the tutor of his sons, to tell the Persians that the Greek fleet was planning to flee from Salamis in fear. Completely deceived by this stratagem, the Persian fleet at dusk stealthily rowed out to guard the exits from the Salamis channel, hoping to catch the fleeing Greeks. This was exactly what Themistocles desired. The Persian fleet was now overconfident and divided, part at each end of

the channel. Next day the Greek ships rowed out as if for flight, but suddenly turned at bay and trapped the unwary Persians. While Xerxes watched the battle from a neighboring hill, he saw more than half his ships rammed, or sunk, or captured. The naval battle of Salamis, fought on September 23, 480 B.C., vindicated the policy of Themistocles, and decided the war. Xerxes despondently returned to Asia with part of his army and the remnant of the fleet, leaving Mardonius with a third of the original army to continue the war.

The Victory at Platæa (479 B.C.). — Before renewing hostilities, Mardonius tried diplomacy. He offered to give Athens her former land, and more, to restore her temples, to exempt her from all penalties for opposing the King of Kings, and to accept her as a free ally of Persia. One Athenian politician favored considering the offer. He was lynched, and his family was stoned to death by angry women. The Athenians would not surrender. To punish such pride, Mardonius burned the city. Then he took up a strong fortified position near Platæa (pl*ȧ*-tē′*ȧ*), in central Greece, north of the Corinthian Gulf.

The Spartans, now grown bolder, crossed the isthmian wall and led the allied Greek army to Platæa. There was won another Greek victory. As at Marathon, the light-armed Persian infantrymen, with wicker shields, bows, and short swords, were no match for the Greek spearmen with their full panoply of metal armor. Mardonius himself was slain, and most of his host. With piety and jubilation the victorious Greeks raised an altar to Zeus the Liberator.

Syracuse and Carthage

The Western Greeks. — While Athens and Sparta were defending the Greek Peninsula against the Persian invasions, another part of the Hellenic world was defending itself with equal success. From the eighth century to the sixth, a considerable number of Greek cities had been founded in the western Mediterranean, along the coasts of Sicily, Italy, France, Spain, and the islands, by colonists from Corinth, Chalcis, Phocæa, and other older cities.[1]

[1] See pp. 141–142.

Some of these western settlements, and above all Syracuse in Sicily, had become powerful, prosperous centers of Hellenic civilization.

Rival Tyrants in Sicily. — The greatness of Syracuse, however, provoked fatal jealousy on the part of her neighbors, particularly during the tyranny of Gelon (jē′lȯn). Like so many dictators, Gelon had first won his laurels as a general; then by force he had seized supreme power in the Sicilian city of Gela. At a time when there was civil war between the masses and the classes in Syracuse, Gelon stepped in with his troops and made himself tyrant of Syracuse, too. To Syracuse he now moved not only his court, but many of the inhabitants, especially the aristocrats, of Gela and other nearby cities, for he was determined to make Syracuse the greatest of Greek states. The common people of the other cities he sold into slavery, because he suspected that they would not make good neighbors. Syracuse he enlarged, fortified, and endowed with a remarkably powerful navy. Almost all of the southeastern corner of Sicily was in his possession. To increase his power, Gelon married the daughter of the tyrant Theron of Acragas, the chief power on the southern coast of Sicily. Against the alliance of Syracuse and Acragas a jealous neighbor (tyrant of Rhegium) tried to build up a rival coalition, but, finding himself outmatched, he resorted to the desperate and dangerous expedient of calling a foreign power to aid him against his fellow-Greeks.

The Carthaginian Peril. — That foreign power was Carthage, the greatest of the colonies established in the western Mediterranean by the Phœnician merchant princes of Tyre.[1] By the year 500 B.C., Carthage had grown to be a wealthy and powerful empire. As an enemy, it might well be feared. It had one of the strongest fleets in the Mediterranean. Its army consisted of fierce barbarians, hired by the wealthy Carthaginian merchants to defend and extend their commercial empire. This was the power against which the Greeks of eastern Sicily had to fight.

The Greek Victory. — Called in by Rhegium, the Carthaginians shipped an immense army across the Mediterranean to Himera (hĭm′ĕr-*ȧ*), on the coast of Sicily. There they were resisted by the armies of Syracuse and Acragas. By a clever stratagem, a body of

[1] See p. 82.

Syracusan cavalry gained admittance to the Carthaginian camp, killed the commander, and burned his ships. Left without their leader, the Carthaginian mercenary troops were either killed or captured. One lone ship escaped to carry back to Carthage the tale of the disaster. The Battle of Himera (480 B.C.), fought on the same day as the Battle of Salamis, freed the western Greeks from the Carthaginian menace for seventy years, just as Salamis saved the eastern Greeks from Persia.

The Rise of an Athenian Empire

Effects of the Persian Wars. — Among the effects of the Persian Wars, three are especially worthy of notice. In the first place, there was a strong feeling, especially in Athens, that the gods had aided the Greeks to achieve their victories over the "Barbarians" (the Greeks called all foreigners "Barbarians"). Poets and statesmen voiced Greek gratitude to Zeus and Athena. At Athens, the spoils of war were used to rebuild the ruined Acropolis, and Persian weapons were cast into a gigantic bronze statue of Athena. The Battle of Marathon inspired one of the most famous Athenian paintings. In short, the victory indirectly stimulated literature and art. Secondly, victory meant freedom for Greek commerce, and therefore prosperity, which is so necessary for the building of temples and the flowering of art; for without wealth Athens could not have had her cultured leisure class. The third effect, the growing prominence of Athens, requires a longer explanation.

Athens Establishes a Naval Empire. — Before the Persian Wars Athens was of only moderate importance among Greek cities. She could not compare with Sparta in power and prestige, nor with Miletus, Samos, and Syracuse in wealth and art. Her single-handed success at Marathon, however, and the naval statesmanship of Themistocles, increased both her prestige and her self-confidence. Above all, the situation after the wars were over offered dazzling opportunities for Athenian statesmen to grasp if they had the vision.

The Opportunity. — The greatest opportunity was presented by Sparta's unwillingness and inability to protect the eastern Greeks

— the Ionian, Æolic, and Doric cities of Asia Minor — against the Persians. To free and defend these Asiatic Greeks required sea-power and a farseeing statesmanship which Sparta did not possess. No better evidence of Sparta's attitude can be given than her cool proposal to deport the inhabitants of the northern Greek states that had aided Persia during the wars, and to transport the Asiatic Greeks to these vacated lands, thus abandoning the eastern shores of the Ægean to Persia. Spartan indifference was Athenian opportunity. Athens could step forward as protector of the Asiatic Greeks against Persia. No sooner was the leadership of Greek naval forces in the Ægean relinquished by Sparta than it was taken up by Athens.

Caryatid from Erechtheum

The Delian Confederacy. — To pay the expenses of defending and policing the Ægean against Persia, Athens formed with the Ionian cities of the islands and of the Asiatic coast a league or confederacy — the Confederacy of Delos (477 B.C.). At the shrine of Apollo on the little island of Delos the federal treasury was to be kept, and there the representatives of the allies were to meet

for the consideration of federal policies. Each member of the league remained independent, with its own government. The chief function of the league was to maintain a federal fleet of two hundred triremes. Athens and a few of the other large states would contribute ships and men, while smaller cities, unable to equip warships themselves, would make their contributions in money.

Its Transformation into an Empire. — Gradually, however, the confederacy of independent states was transformed into an Athenian Empire. One by one, states that had furnished ships and sailors found it more convenient to contribute money, leaving to the Athenians the more arduous and dangerous duties of naval warfare. The leadership as well as the fighting fell more and more to the lot of Athens, until the federal congress quietly passed out of existence. Thus foreign policy and war were conducted more and more by Athens herself, and her allies assumed the position of protected states, paying annual money contributions for the services of the Athenian navy. Moreover, important criminal cases were brought to Athens for trial, and thus the Empire began to assume a certain amount of legal unity. In some cases allied states rebelled, but they were subdued and reduced to the position of tribute-paying dependencies. Political unity was increased by the establishment of democracies, like that of Athens and with Athenian encouragement or support, in many of the confederated states. Financial unity was increased by the transfer of the federal treasury from Delos to Athens.

Athenian Sea-Power and Trade. — The establishment of the Delian confederacy made Athens the chief naval power of the Ægean. The Ægean became an Athenian lake. And hand in hand with naval power went commercial expansion. Increasingly Athens exported manufactures and imported food and raw materials, from the Black Sea coasts, from Italy and Sicily, from Egypt. Themistocles was so much interested in fostering this overseas commerce that he named one of his daughters Italia and another Sybaris.

Fortification of Athens. — Supreme though she might be on the seas, Athens would still have remained at the mercy of Sparta on

land, had not Themistocles protected the city with strong walls. He did so against the will of Sparta, for Sparta proposed that Athens instead of rebuilding her ruined fortifications should join with Sparta in compelling all cities north of the Isthmus of Corinth to demolish their walls. If Themistocles had bowed to the will of Sparta in this matter, Athens and all northern Greek cities would have been little better than vassals trembling under the shadow of Spartan militarism. The shrewd Athenian, however, went to Sparta and deceived the Spartans with one pretext after another, simply to gain time, while at Athens men, women, and children toiled frantically to build a wall six feet thick, sixteen feet high, and four or five miles long, encircling their city. Once the wall was built, little did Athens need to heed Sparta's displeasure.

The Harbor. — Then Themistocles pushed on to realize another of his dreams. On the promontory of the Piræus, with its fine



PIRÆUS AND ATHENS, SHOWING THE LONG WALLS

harbors, he hoped to create a new city, a port for Athens, fortified so strongly that as long as Athens ruled the seas her citizens could take shelter in the Piræus, living on imported food, and defying the Peloponnesians. The fortified port of Themistocles on the

Piræus was in later years connected with Athens by the famous "Long Walls," almost five miles long, between which ran the road from Athens to the port.

Statesmanship of Themistocles. — Though he did not accomplish all this by his own unaided efforts, nevertheless Themistocles may be regarded as the statesman who saw and grasped the opportunity to make Athens a great sea-power, a rival rather than a vassal of Sparta. His genius lay in the keen vision with which he saw opportunities to which others might be blind, in the shrewdness with which he foresaw the effects present policies would have in the future, in the persuasive clarity with which he could explain his plans, in the unfailing ingenuity and resourcefulness with which he could triumph over obstacles. He was popular, too, partly because of the good nature with which he mingled among his fellow citizens in the market place, and partly because of the success of his policies. Yet he was undoubtedly too boastful, and his enemies accused him of accepting bribes. Probably the truth was that his opponents envied his greatness. Others feared that his anti-Spartan policy might lead to disaster. Particularly the proud old noble families, the landed interests, opposed him. In the end he was ostracized, and as an exile he took refuge in Asia Minor, where the Persians gave him wealth and respect. His fate is an eloquent commentary both on the ingratitude of the city for which he had done so much, and on the willingness of Greek politicians to go over to the "Barbarians" if they lost power at home.

Aristides. — Three other statesmen may be given credit for sharing with Themistocles the labor and the honor of making Athens the foremost city of Greece. There was Aristides "the Just," who before Salamis had opposed Themistocles' policy of navalism, and who had been ostracized by Themistocles' followers, but had been allowed to return to join in the defense of Athens against Xerxes. Having covered himself with glory during the war, he regained his position as one of the chief political figures in Athens. Instead of opposing navalism now, he aided Themistocles. It was Aristides who arranged the details of the Delian Confederacy and achieved the seemingly impossible task of

deciding to the satisfaction of everyone the amount that each city should contribute to the league.

Cimon. — Then there was Cimon (sī′mŏn), that handsome aristocrat, the ablest admiral[1] and one of the most popular men in Athens. At banquets he was the soul of jollity, and his sea-songs never failed to amuse the diners. To the poor he was the spirit of generosity. His servants distributed money and clothing to needy neighbors. His fields were unfenced, so that any man could help himself to fruit. When he was in power as an official, he carried out plans for beautifying the city. For instance, he enlarged the Acropolis and set upon it the great bronze statue of Athena; he erected fine public buildings around the Market Place and planted plane-trees there for shade; he brought to Athens the alleged bones of the legendary hero Theseus; he made the Academy, outside the city walls, a beautiful park for recreation and athletics. Yet he ultimately lost his popularity through his unfortunate proposal to aid Sparta in suppressing a revolt of the helots (the Messenian Revolt). The Spartans, distrustful of Athens, ungraciously refused the help of the army which Cimon brought to their aid. On his return, Cimon was disgraced and ostracized.

The Age of Pericles

Pericles. — Pericles was only about thirty years old when he became the most prominent politician in Athens, about 461 B.C. For thirty years he was the democratic leader, or — in modern terms — the political boss, of Athens.

Like the other Athenian leaders of his day, he was wealthy by inheritance and a nobleman by birth. His family had given him the best education money could provide, including gymnastic training, of course, and the study of literature, of singing to the accompaniment of the lyre, of the principles of argument and philosophy.

His Political Position. — In the time of Pericles the highest officials in the state were the ten Generals or *Strategi*, who com-

[1] He had won brilliant naval victories in the wars against the Persians. His father, we may also note, was Miltiades, the Athenian general who won the battle of Marathon.

manded the army and navy and also had charge of foreign affairs. Pericles was one of the Generals, and was re-elected year after year. His power, however, depended not merely on his official authority as a General, but even more on his influence over the Assembly; and his influence over the Assembly depended on his eloquence and his popularity. As his friend, the historian Thucydides, said, Pericles derived his popularity "from his capacity and acknowledged worth," for, "being also a man of transparent integrity, he was able to control the multitude in a free spirit; he led them rather than was led by them." No weak politician he, but a statesman courageous enough to oppose and even to anger the people when necessary. His wisdom, his majestic eloquence, his irresistible enthusiasm for the greatness of Athens, must have been qualities that would command respect. Perhaps we might add, too, that his policy of building temples and other public buildings gave employment to workingmen, while his foreign policies enriched the merchants. Moreover, instead of asking officials to give their services free, he proposed or at least practised the new policy of drawing from the public treasury a daily wage for the thousands of older men and naval veterans who served as jurors, and a food allowance for all citizens who attended the dramas, choral singing, and other public entertainments, which at that time formed part of the public religious festivals. All these measures must have helped to increase the popularity of Pericles.



PERICLES

The Athenian Democracy. — The Athens of Pericles is intensely interesting as an experiment in democracy. It was a democracy

very different from ours. Modern democracies are usually governments by elected representatives of the people. The Athenian democracy was much more literally what the word means — "the rule of the people."

The Assembly. — The mainspring of the government, the Assembly, consisted of all Athenian citizens, rather than a few hundred representatives. If all who had the right attended, it would have been a mass-meeting, with over fifty thousand members. Usually only a minority were present, but the minimum attendance was much larger than any modern legislature. The Assembly had the final decision on treaties and on war and peace; it could remove any official from office or condemn him to death for wrongdoing; it could pass decrees dealing with almost any concern of the government. In theory, this was the purest and simplest form of democracy. It was based on the principle that the people who eat the broth are the best judges of its quality; that the people who are governed are the final judges of the government. As Pericles is reported to have said, "If few of us are originators, we are all sound judges of a policy."

The Council of 500. — The details of the government were left to a large extent in the hands of a much smaller body, the Council of Five Hundred, consisting of citizens chosen annually by lot. And the Five Hundred in turn left such matters to committees, for it was divided into ten committees of fifty members, and each such committee had charge of affairs for a tenth of the year. These committees not only prepared government business for the consideration of the Assembly, but also supervised the administration, inspected the army and navy, and tested candidates for office.

Officials. — The chief officials — the ten Generals — were elected by the Assembly each year. So also was the Superintendent of the Water Supply. All the other officials were chosen by lot. Among these officials, the Archons were no longer very important, since most of their powers had been transferred partly to the Generals and partly to a large number of other officials. The duties of the government had increased to such an extent that several hundred officials were now needed to deal with taxes

and expenditures, public buildings, supervision of the market, inspection of weights and measures, road repairs, and many other affairs. Usually a board of ten men was appointed by lot, for one year, to deal with each such subject, and the work of the board was examined every three months by the Assembly.

Choice by Lot. — The choice of most officials and also of the Five Hundred by lot instead of by election was not based on any gambler's instinct, but on democratic principles. Election tends to give preference to men of exceptional ability, wealth, or training. Lot gives citizens equal opportunity. The very poor (the *thetes*, see p. 153), to be sure, were excluded from all higher offices, but citizens of the middle and upper classes were eligible regardless of birth, wealth, or ability. Choice by lot makes it impossible for professional politicians to practise the "spoils system." But above all, since the term was only one year, this system gave thousands of the common people actual experience in the government, and thus made them better fitted to vote intelligently in the Assembly. Thousands had served on the committees of the Five Hundred. Thousands had been chosen by lot to serve a year on some board of administrative officials. No country has ever had a citizen body with a more thorough political education.

The Juries. — The principle of choice by lot was also employed in the jury system, which played a most important rôle in Athenian life. The Athenian courts were really juries, without lawyers or judges. And the juries were large, consisting of 401, 501, or even more members, because a smaller number might be more easily bribed or intimidated, or might fail to give decisions in accordance with general public opinion. The jurymen, six thousand of them in all, were chosen each year by lot, and were paid a small wage by the government. Decisions must have been based more on public opinion than on technical law, though the laws were simple. And the pleading was not done by professional lawyers, with learned legal arguments, but by the citizens themselves, each defending his own case (although their speeches were often written by lawyers).

Legislation. — The jury system was also applied to legislation. Any citizen could propose bills in the Assembly. But instead of

giving a final decision on bills, the Assembly passed them on to a special jury of "legislators" for ratification. After listening to arguments for and against the bill, the jury voted, without having taken part in the debate. Thus laws received careful and non-partisan examination, since the jury was chosen by lot.

The Funeral Oration of Pericles. — The most eloquent statement of the principles on which this government was founded may be found in the Funeral Oration pronounced by Pericles in honor of Athenian soldiers who had fallen in war.[1] A few of his sentences are worth quoting, and pondering. "While the law secures equal justice to all alike in their private disputes, the claim of excellence is also recognized, and when a citizen is in any way distinguished, he is preferred to the public service, not as a matter of privilege, but as the reward of merit." When Pericles added that poverty was no bar to public service, he exaggerated, for the very poor (the *thetes*) were excluded from the higher offices. But there is wisdom in his statement that "to avow poverty with us is no disgrace; the true disgrace is in doing nothing to avoid it." And there is a moral for all democracies in this sentence: "We regard a man who takes no interest in public affairs as a useless character." Athenians had a high sense of civic duty. Pericles himself considered the state more important than his estate; to the former he devoted his own abilities; the latter he entrusted to a slave for management. Wealthy citizens vied with each other in paying the cost of public entertainments and religious festivals. When temples or public buildings were constructed, the same small daily wage was paid to the contractor, the freeman, and the slave laborer. If Athens gave much to her citizens, she expected much. In the words of Pericles, the greatness of Athens was due "to men with the fighter's daring, the wise man's understanding of his duty, and the good man's self-discipline in its performance."

Athens the "School of Hellas." — Whatever judgment is passed on the merits of Athenian democracy as a method of govern-

[1] It is thought that the historian Thucydides, who quotes this oration in his history, may have given us his own words instead of recording exactly what Pericles said. But probably the ideas are closely in harmony with those of Pericles.

ment, there can be no question that it produced results in the sphere of civilization. Pericles called Athens the "School of Hellas," and it was a school in a very real way. From an early age children were educated not for business success but for good citizenship. Boys were trained in gymnastics and athletics, to make able-bodied soldiers and sailors; they learned the legends and religious traditions of their country by reading the poets; they studied the careers of heroes and famous men as models for their own lives. Boys of the wealthier families studied the principles of argument and public speaking, and learned to sing lyric poems and play the lyre — an accomplishment of every cultured Athenian. In later life education was continued. As members of the Assembly, or as officials chosen by lot, Athenians were drawn into public service and acquired a political education; they were paid, so that poverty would not interfere.

A Greek Athlete
Myron's discus-thrower.

Music and Drama. — Education in literature and music were connected with the public religious festivals, of which there were about sixty during the course of the year. Some of the chief

festivals were celebrated not only by processions, athletic contests, and sports, but also by public choral singing and the presentation of dramas. For instance, at the festival of the Dionysia, in the spring, fifteen plays were performed in the great public theater of Dionysus, before an audience of about twenty thousand persons. The dramas were staged at the expense of wealthy citizens and the choruses were sung, not by professional actors and singers, but by amateurs. Each year a thousand or even two thousand Athenian youths and men were selected to participate in the public choruses and learned the words of one or more dramas and the music to which the choruses were set. When, later in life, they sat in the audience, they watched the drama and listened to the singing with the interest and knowledge of ex-performers. Attendance in the theater on such occasions, we may add, was not simply for entertainment; it was regarded as part of a man's civic and religious duty, because the festivals were held to honor the gods.

As the dramas to be presented were chosen on a competitive basis, only the best being accepted, there was keen rivalry among dramatists, and as new plays were presented at each festival there was a strong stimulus to writing. These two facts may help to explain why fifth-century Athens gave the world several of its greatest dramas — above all, the tragedies of Æschylus (ĕs′kĭ-lŭs), Sophocles (sŏf′ō-klēz), and Euripides (ū-rĭp′ĭ-dēz), and the comedies of Aristophanes (ăr′ĭs-tŏf′ȧ-nēz).

The real founder of Athenian drama was a veteran of the Persian Wars, Æschylus (525–456 B.C.), who wrote tragedies to be acted by two actors and a chorus. With the exception of "The Persians," dealing with the downfall of Persian pride, the tragedies of Æschylus dealt with the gods and mythical heroes of the old Homeric poems. A certain majesty and solemnity and a stern belief in the necessity for the punishment of crime and wickedness were characteristic of Æschylus and of the age for which he wrote.

Sophocles (495–406 B.C.), thirty years younger, improved the technique of the theater by adding a third actor, and wrote tragedies of surpassing poetic beauty. Like Æschylus, he wrote about legendary heroes, and generally accepted the will of the gods and

the mysterious force of destiny as the powers ruling men's lives, but he showed with greater human sympathy the emotions of men and women in the great crises of life. Among his most celebrated tragedies were "King Œdipus," "Antigone," and "Electra."

Somewhat later, Euripides (480–406 B.C.), the third of the great tragic poets, still further improved the technique of the stage, and, to hold the interest of the audience, made the plot more complicated and more romantic. As he shows them, the gods are often only symbols. "All folly is to men their Aphrodite." What he was most interested in was the actual characters and feelings of human beings. He may have been less dignified and less majestic than Æschylus and Sophocles, but he was also more human and more modern. His plays, particularly "Medea," the "Bacchæ," and "Orestes," won great popularity in the ancient world.

Still younger was Aristophanes (444–380 B.C.), the peerless comic poet, who mocked and burlesqued the politicians of his day, social customs, and public life, with a freedom as great as his wit was keen. One of his most striking comedies, "The Lysistrata," produced during the Peloponnesian War,[1] shows the women seizing the Acropolis, and forcing the men to make peace. His even more famous comedy entitled "The Frogs" was produced just before Athens sank into exhaustion and defeat as a result of the Peloponnesian War.

Public Art. — The same spirit that produced the drama promoted art and architecture. Though most Athenians doubtless lived in rather poor houses, wealth and labor were lavished on the temples of the gods and the public buildings of the democracy. Art was for the honor of the state and its gods, rather than for the private pleasure of the individual. The great painting of the battle of Marathon was on the walls of a public building at the Market Place, rather than in an aristocrat's private gallery.

The Parthenon. — The finest buildings were the temples, and of them all the most famous is the Parthenon, the temple of Athena, which was built on the Acropolis during the time of Pericles, and which still stands there, though in ruins. It is not a very large

[1] See below, pp. 200–202.

building, but it is exquisitely proportioned and has a dignity that many a larger building lacks. Its interior was divided into two halls. The smaller of these, at the western end, was called the Parthenon, or "virgin's chamber," and has given its name to the entire building. The larger hall, facing the rising sun, contained a statue of Athena, thirty feet tall, with garments of gold and flesh of ivory. As the hall was only a hundred feet long, doubtless worshippers stood outside, looking in at the radiant goddess,

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

THE PARTHENON

As it appeared in the time of Pericles.

through the double row of marble columns that stood in front of the door.

Phidias. — The statue was the work of Phidias (fĭd′ĭ-ăs), master artist of Athens. As the friend and agent of Pericles, Phidias supervised the whole work of erecting the temple, and in particular superintended the sculptors who carried out his designs in carving the beautiful figures of men and gods that adorn the pediments, and the matchless frieze of sculpture in relief that runs round the walls, inside the colonnade.

Characteristics of Athenian Art. — The illustrations in the text give a clearer picture than any words can paint of the Parthenon itself and of the sculpture which adorned it. But certain features of Greek art and architecture of this period may well be em-

phasized. One point is that temples and often sculpture were painted in bright colors, which must have been brilliant indeed in the clear Attic sunlight. Another point is that most sculpture and architecture were religious and public in purpose. That purpose explains why the sculptors who embellished the Parthenon chose to portray mythological scenes connected with the legends of Athens, instead of dealing with everyday subjects. It explains why Greek sculpture in general preferred mythological subjects, the chief exception being a growing fondness for athletic and military heroes. Since art was public and mainly religious, the

Statuary on the Parthenon

sculpture of Periclean Athens was perhaps a little more conventional, perhaps a little more stiffly dignified, than modern sculpture. Phidias and his fellow-workers strove for strength and nobility, rather than dainty delicacy. One other observation to be made is that the popularity of athletics in ancient Greece not only stimulated an interest in the human body, but provided sculptors with splendid models of muscular development.

Athens the Center of Culture. — Any small city of our age that in a single century could produce four world-famous dramatists, a statesman of Pericles' stature, and a Phidias, would be regarded as somewhat unusual. But Athens had still other contributions to

make. The cultured city of Pericles exercised a magnetic attraction for men of genius. Philosophers,[1] poets, and scientists flocked to Athens, and although at the beginning of the fifth century Athens might have been regarded as mediocre in intellectual accomplishments, by the end of the century she was really beginning to justify the title, "School of Hellas."

Historians. — Among the foreigners who came to Athens in Pericles' time was Herodotus (hĕ-rŏd′ō-tŭs), "father of history," who wrote an account of the Persian War, and of the history and customs of the "barbarian" peoples of the countries round about Greece. Thucydides (thū-sĭd′ĭ-dēz), a younger historian whose fame rivals that of Herodotus, was a native Athenian, and his great work was a history of the war between Athens and Sparta.

Pindar's Poetry. — The greatest lyric poet of the age, Pindar, was not an Athenian, but a citizen of Thebes,[2] rival and often enemy of Athens. Yet Pindar came to Athens to study music under well-known Athenian teachers, and he praised Athens with an eloquence that a native could not have excelled. The Athenians so appreciated both his poetry and his praise, that they appointed him their representative in Thebes, presented him with a large sum of money, and erected his statue in Athens.

Limitations of Athenian Democracy. — If Athenian democracy was fruitful in the fine arts, it was, after all, a limited democracy. It was a democracy in which the women, the paupers, the slaves, the aliens, and the dependencies of Athens were excluded from full political rights. About each of these a paragraph of explanation is necessary.

(1) *The Position of Women.* — Women had no political rights in Athens. Democracy was for men. More and more the oriental practice of keeping wives in seclusion was taking the place of the relative freedom women had enjoyed in the Homeric Age. As girls received little education, they were increasingly regarded as intellectual inferiors; just as in physical strength they were considered weaker. Woman's place was in the home, bringing up

[1] The philosophers will be treated of in the next chapter. See pp. 218–222.

[2] This city of Thebes was situated in Greece and should not be confused with the older city of Thebes in Egypt.

children, while men found their pleasures more and more in the society of other men, gossiping in the Market Place, arguing in political meetings, singing and making merry at banquets, or engaging in athletic sports, or lounging and talking in the pleasant Academy. Some Athenian men, like Pericles himself, enjoyed the society of non-Athenian women, who were social outsiders, but somewhat better educated and less bound by social customs than Athenian wives. A hint, however, that in some households Athenian women still had both respect and influence may be found in the remark Themistocles is said to have addressed to his son: "You have more power than anyone else in Greece; for the Athenians command the rest of the Greeks, I command the Athenians, your mother commands me, and you command your mother."

(2) *Poverty.* — The very poor (*thetes*) could be Athenian citizens, if their parents were citizens, and could sit in the Assembly. For them the state did much in the way of providing employment on public works, payment for attendance at the Assembly, food allowances at festival times, and other forms of assistance. But so long as they remained poor, they could not be admitted to the higher administrative offices of the state.

(3) *Slavery.* — A considerable part of the population, probably somewhat less than half, consisted of slaves, who had no political rights whatsoever. Many of them were captives, or children of captives, taken in the Persian War, or in other wars. Others had been captured, kidnapped, or purchased from non-Greek lands. In the mines, the lot of the slave was exceedingly hard, and his life was short. In agriculture, industry, or domestic service, on the other hand, the slave was rather well treated. In the shops slaves often worked side by side with their owners, both working with their hand tools, under the same conditions.

It would be a mistake to think of the Athenian freemen as parasites supported by slave-labor. As a matter of fact, a great many Athenian citizens must have been hard-working craftsmen or farmers, with incomes barely large enough to pay the heavy taxes and support a family in frugal style. The craftsmen, or manufacturers, still worked in their own homes, or in small shops, for the most part, with perhaps a slave or two, and a few sons or

THE ATHENIAN EMPIRE, ABOUT 450 B.C.

neighbors' boys learning the trade as apprentices. Only a few large shops or factories existed, in which manufactures were produced for export, on a fairly large scale. And only a small number of Athenians possessed many slaves or great wealth. According to one estimate, there were only 2500 men in the two highest property classes[1] as compared with 33,000 in the middle class, and about 20,000 in the poorest class of freemen. Counting women and children, the free population was about 150,000, the alien population 40,000, and the slave population about 100,000.

(4) *Aliens.* — Not only women and slaves, but also aliens ("metics") were denied political rights. Themistocles had sought to attract foreign workingmen by exempting them from the tax on aliens. And as Athens grew, her population of alien workers and traders became very large. There were said to be 40,000 aliens (men, women, and children). Many were cultured and wealthy. But regardless of culture, wealth, or length of residence, no alien could be a citizen, for citizenship was hereditary.

(5) *The Athenian Empire.* — Finally, we come to the dependencies. The Delian Confederacy had become an empire. In the time of Pericles Athens had an empire of more than four hundred subject cities which enjoyed a considerable measure of local self-government but were required to pay taxes to Athens. Theoretically, these taxes were contributions to a federal treasury for the maintenance of a federal navy, but since the days of Aristides the treasury had been moved to Athens and the navy had become practically an Athenian navy, which did the bidding of the Athenian people. Moreover, the taxes were no longer used exclusively for the navy, but were devoted in part to the artistic embellishment of the Athenian Acropolis. For this use of the funds Pericles was bitterly criticized by his political enemies in Athens; but the "allied" or dependent cities had no voice in the matter. The "allies" were also required to send their important legal cases to Athens.

Athenian Expansion. — Under Pericles the Delian Confederacy was not only transformed into an empire ruled by Athens, but the

[1] See p. 152.

empire was extended by exceedingly ambitious efforts. Originally including Athens together with the eastern shores and islands of the Ægean Sea, the empire was enlarged to include Thrace, the Hellespont, and the Black Sea. With extreme audacity Athenian admirals were sent to wrest Cyprus and Egypt from Persia; but such enterprises were too great for Athens. Meanwhile Athens was attempting to expand on the mainland, in the Greek Peninsula. No longer content with safety behind their strong walls, the Athenians secured either as allies or as dependencies a number of neighboring states (Bœotia, Phocis, Locri, Achæa, Trœzen, Ægina, Thessaly) in central and northern Greece. Athenian land-power, however it might seem to challenge the older supremacy of Sparta, was less securely founded than Athenian sea-power, and after a very brief duration it was overthrown by Sparta.

Athenian Rivalry with Sparta and Corinth. — The rise of Athens was a challenge to Sparta, hitherto leader of the Greek states. Between the democracy of Athens and the conservative military oligarchy of Sparta there could hardly be anything other than enmity. The final trial of strength between the rivals came toward the close of Pericles' life. Political considerations may have had something to do with the outbreak of war. Pericles, his power weakening, may have felt unable to resist popular demands for war, or he may have hoped that war would revive his popularity. His opponents had accused his beloved Aspasia of irreligion and immorality; they had dared accuse him, as well as his friend Phidias, of embezzlement. War would please the merchant classes, if it extended their commerce, and it would arouse the enthusiasm of patriots. The economic motives must have been important. Corinth, a member of the Peloponnesian League and an ally of Sparta, was an unsuccessful commercial competitor of Athens, and her bitterness toward Athens was intensified when the latter aided the former Corinthian colony of Corcyra. Athens, on the other hand, desired Corcyra as a stepping-stone to Sicily and Italy, toward whose wealth greedy eyes had often been turned by ambitious Athenians.

The Peloponnesian War. — The war began in the year 431 B.C. Pericles urged the Athenians to shut themselves up inside their

city walls, defying the armies of the Peloponnesian League, and trusting Athenian sea-power to win the war. The plan had its difficulties. It was not easy to watch enemy armies devastating Attic farms. It was still less easy when pestilence broke out in the overcrowded city, carrying off Pericles and many of his fellow citizens. Colonies began to revolt. Discouraged by ten years of hardship, the Athenians made peace (421 B.C.).

The Sicilian Expedition. — Soon, however, they renewed the war and sent a magnificent fleet of 134 picked triremes to conquer Sicily. The expedition was daring to the point of folly, yet perhaps it might have succeeded, had it been managed by the brilliant leader who proposed it. After he had set sail, this man of reckless genius, Alcibiades (ăl′sĭ-bī′*a*-dēz), was ordered to resign his command because he was accused of having made fun of the sacred Eleusinian mysteries. This accusation was the result of other persons' having disfigured the Hermæ (the statues of the god Hermes, standing at the doorways of Athenian homes). Under other generals, the expedition laid siege to the strong city of Syracuse in Sicily. Meanwhile Alcibiades turned traitor and persuaded Sparta to send a skillful general to aid Syracuse. In vain the Athenians besieged Syracuse. In vain Athens sent another fleet, of 73 triremes, to Sicily. Athenian naval power was staked on the success of this venture. And it failed. The ships were destroyed or captured, the crews defeated, and the survivors were sold as slaves (413 B.C.).

Defeat of Athens. — The Sicilian disaster was the beginning of the end, but Athens fought grimly for almost ten years more, in spite of political upheavals at home, in spite of high taxes and pauperized ex-farmers. Persia lent her aid to Sparta. All the world seemed to be joining to overthrow the city of Athena. Most of the Greek cities on the peninsula, besides Sicily, Persia, and some of Athens' own colonies, were now in the coalition that Sparta had formed. Moreover, the coalition had a fleet that was strong enough to dispute the mastery of the seas with the weakened Athenian navy. The end came in 404 B.C., after twenty-seven years of war. In defeat and despair the Athenians accepted terms of peace that required them to tear down their Long Walls, reduce

their fleet to twelve ships, and acknowledge the leadership of Sparta in war and peace. The empire founded on ships had come to an end.

The Imperishable Empire of Athens. — To end the chapter with these words would be to ignore something more important than ships, naval supremacy, or walls. The statesmen of fifth-century Athens had built on firmer foundations an empire of the mind. Though in questions of war and peace Athens was reduced to be the vassal of Sparta, in questions of art and literature, philosophy and science, the greatness of Athens continued into the following century and beyond, and the artistic and intellectual empire of Athens spread in the ancient world farther than the ships of Themistocles or Pericles had ever sailed.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Summarize the steps by which the Persian Empire was expanded, from the accession of Cyrus to the Ionian Revolt. Can you give any reasons for the success and rapidity with which the Persian Emperors enlarged their realm?

2. Describe the extent and government of the Persian Empire under Darius.

3. How did the ambition of Crœsus, through its indirect effects, become one of the factors that caused the Græco-Persian Wars?

4. Summarize the causes of the war between Athens and Persia.

5. Why is Marathon regarded generally as one of the world's most important battles? Was it more or less important than Thermopylæ? Than Salamis? Than Platæa? Than Himera?

6. What measures did Themistocles take for the purpose of making Athens a great sea-power? How would you compare his policies and achievements with those of Pericles?

7. What differences existed between the civilization and institutions of the Persian Empire, on the one hand, and those of the Greek city-states on the other hand? In view of these differences, what can you say about the significance of the struggle between Greeks and Persians?

8. Contrast the Greek city-state ideal (as discussed in the preceding chapter) with the Persian system of militaristic imperialism.

9. What were the effects of the Persian Wars on the Greek city-states?

10. How and why was the Delian Confederacy organized? How was it transformed into an Athenian Empire? What were the rights and duties of the subordinate members of the Confederacy?

11. Describe the operation of the Athenian democracy in the period of Pericles. Compare or contrast the government of Periclean Athens with that of a modern city or a modern state.

12. In what respects was the government of the Athenian Empire under Pericles undemocratic?

13. How can you justify the description of Athens as "the school of Hellas"?

14. What events brought about the downfall of the Athenian naval empire at the end of the fifth century B.C.?

SPECIAL TOPICS

Greek economic life. BOTSFORD, *Hellenic History*, 258–266, 394–410; VAN HOOK, *Greek Life and Thought*, ch. viii; ZIMMERN, *Greek Commonwealth*, 213–285; GLOTZ, *Ancient Greece at Work*, 245–262 (agriculture), 263–287 (industry), 288–324 (trade).

Slavery in Athens. GLOTZ, *Ancient Greece at Work*, 192–219.

The Battle of Marathon. JAMES, *Our Hellenic Heritage*, I, 279–297; CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY, IV, ch. viii.

Thermopylæ. JAMES, *Our Hellenic Heritage*, I, 298–329; CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY, IV, 291–300.

The Athenian Empire. JAMES, *Our Hellenic Heritage*, II, 21–49; FERGUSON, *Greek Imperialism*, 38–43, 66–78; BOTSFORD AND SIHLER, *Hellenic Civilization*, 255–273; CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY, V, 40–46; 50–61.

Periclean Athens, the City Beautiful. JAMES, *Our Hellenic Heritage*, II, 50–78; VAN HOOK, *Greek Life and Thought*, ch. iv; BURY, *History of Greece*, 367–376; C. H. WELLER, *A hens and Its Monuments*.

Pericles. HOPKINSON, *Greek Leaders*, 37–58; PLUTARCH, *Lives* (Pericles); JAMES, *Our Hellenic Heritage* (use index).

Crœsus. BURY, *History of Greece*, 223–229; CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY, III, 517–526.

The Persian Empire. BOTSFORD, *Source Book of Ancient History*, 55–65; CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY, IV, 184–211.

Herodotus. JAMES, *Our Hellenic Heritage*, II, 322–330; SHOTWELL, *Introduction to the History of History*, ch. xiii.

Athenian democracy. GLOTZ, *Ancient Greece at Work*, 145–177; JAMES, *Our Hellenic Heritage*, II, 82–110; BOTSFORD AND SIHLER, *Hellenic Civilization*, 222–236; CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY, V, ch. iv.

Pericles' funeral oration. THUCYDIDES, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, Book II.

Greek drama. VAN HOOK, *Greek Life and Thought*, ch. xiii; JAMES, *Our Hellenic Heritage*, II, 378–404.

The Sicilian expedition. JAMES, *Our Hellenic Heritage*, II, 177–231; BURY, *History of Greece*, 463–489; THUCYDIDES, *Peloponnesian War*, Books VI–VII.

Hippocrates and medicine. BOTSFORD AND SIHLER, *Hellenic Civilization*, 295–301.

Greek writing and books. VAN HOOK, *Greek Life and Thought*, ch. ix.

Education at Athens. VAN HOOK, *Greek Life and Thought*, ch. xi; TUCKER, *Life in Ancient Athens*, ch. ix.

Themistocles. PLUTARCH, *Lives* (Themistocles).

The Metics. GLOTZ, *Ancient Greece at Work*, 178–191.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THE TEACHER

G. W. BOTSFORD, *Hellenic History*. J. B. BURY, *History of Greece*. CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY, IV, chs. vii–xi; V, chs. i–xv. A. E. ZIMMERN, *The Greek Commonwealth*. G. GLOTZ, *Ancient Greece at Work*. W. S. DAVIS, *A Day in Old Athens*. W. S. FERGUSON, *Greek Imperialism*. A. J. GRANT, *Greece in the Age of Pericles*. E. ABBOTT, *Pericles and the Golden Age of Athens*. G. GROTE, *History of Greece* (12 vols.). C. H. WELLER, *Athens and Its Monuments*. G. L. DICKINSON, *Greek View of Life*. A. M. SHEPARD, *Sea Power in Ancient History*. W. W. HYDE, *Greek Religion*. P. M. SYKES, *History of Persia*. A. V. W. JACKSON, *Persia, Past and Present*.

CONVENIENT SOURCE MATERIALS

BOTSORD AND SIHLER, *Hellenic Civilization*. R. W. LIVINGSTONE, *Pageant of Greece*. THUCYDIDES, *History of the Peloponnesian War*. PLUTARCH, *Lives* (particularly Themistocles, Aristides, Cimon, Pericles, Nicias, Alcibiades). ARISTOTLE, *Constitution of Athens*. HERODOTUS, *History*.

CHAPTER VII

ALEXANDER'S EMPIRE AND THE EXPANSION OF GREEK CIVILIZATION

Political Changes in the Hellenic World of City-States

City Walls and the Hellenic World. — The destruction of the Athenian walls symbolized the great change that was coming over the Hellenic world. Other Greek cities, hundreds of them, had their walls, like Athens. Within their walls, these cities had built their temples, worshipped their gods, made constitutions, given birth to artists and thinkers. Athens was not unique in these respects. In any one of scores of other cities, we could have traced the development of government through monarchy, aristocracy, tyranny, and oligarchy, to democracy, or the improvement of architecture and sculpture, or the progress of literature and thought. Athens was selected only because she excelled her rivals.

The Hellenic World. — It is important to remember that the Greek or Hellenic world included not only Athens with her dependencies in the Ægean, but also hundreds of other Greek cities in the Greek Peninsula, on the coasts of the Black Sea, in Sicily and southern Italy, and even a few as far west as the Mediterranean shores of France and Spain. The Hellenic world comprised not Athens alone, nor the Greek Peninsula alone, but the coastlands of the whole system of seas that lie between Europe, Asia, and Africa.

Spiritual Walls. — City walls had been a protection, and city patriotism had been the inspiration for political and cultural developments in this sea-coast world of the Greeks. But walls confine as well as protect. Hellenic culture did not achieve its finest triumphs until the walls were broken down. The walls of stone, of course, were not always destroyed. But the spiritual

walls of city independence, of a patriotism that literally reached no farther than the eye could see, of a culture that was more interested in the local acropolis than in the outside world — these spiritual walls were crumbling during the period in which the stone walls of the Athenians were torn down.

An Age of Expansion. — In other words, Hellenic civilization was ceasing to be a city-state civilization. It was expanding. Particularly is this true of the fourth and third centuries B.C. And the process may be seen in political life as well as in other forms of activity.

Tendency toward Federation. — The tendency toward the expansion or consolidation of city-states into larger units began before the fourth century. Even before the Persian Wars Sparta had formed her Peloponnesian League, federating most of the states of the Peloponnesus under her military leadership. During the Persian War, that league had expanded temporarily into an alliance of most of the Greek states that dared resist Persia; but when stress of danger was removed, the larger alliance had broken down though the Peloponnesian League remained. After the defeat of the Persians, Athens in the fifth century had united the cities of the Ægean Sea under her control, as Sparta had united the Peloponnesus. More than one statesman had dreamed of going one step farther, and bringing the rival leagues, along with other Greek cities, into some sort of harmony if not actual federation.

Cultural Unity of Greece. — Religion, language, and other cultural factors seemed to favor such harmony. The worship of Zeus and of the other Olympian gods was practically universal among the Greeks; and to the religious festivals at Olympia in honor of Zeus, as well as to the Pythian (pĭth′ĭ-ăn) games at Delphi (dĕl′fī) in honor of Apollo, Greek cities far and near sent their representatives. In language the Hellenes were one people, though they spoke various dialects of Greek. In art and architecture, music, poetry, and philosophy, there were various styles and local centers, but there was also a great deal of similarity, imitation, and interchange. Even in political institutions there was widespread uniformity. The cities in the Peloponnesian League were oligarchies; while most of the others were

democracies, with constitutions that offered many striking resemblances to that of Athens.

Reasons for Political Disunity. — Yet in spite of such similarities the Hellenic cities remained more conscious of their differences; and instead of uniting they fought the disastrous Peloponnesian War. There were two chief reasons for the continued disunity and conflict in the Hellenic world. One was that even when a number of cities were united under a strong power such as Athens or Sparta, the dependent cities remained more or less discontented, cherishing hopes of freedom. The other reason was that several cities aspired to be leaders, to be dominant. Sparta might subdue its neighbors in the Peloponnesus; Athens might unite her neighbors in the Ægean; and Syracuse might unify most of Sicily; but no one of them could unite the whole Greek world. The defeat of Athens in the Peloponnesian War left Sparta the strongest state in the eastern part, and Syracuse the strongest in the western part of the Hellenic world. But Sparta then had her difficulties with weaker states such as Athens, Thebes, Corinth, and Argos, as well as with the great Persian Empire; and Syracuse had her local rivals as well as the Carthaginians to oppose her power.

Carthage and Syracuse. — The Carthaginians had been defeated by Syracuse, as the reader will perhaps remember, in the early part of the fifth century,[1] and for seventy years after 480 B.C. Sicily had breathed freely. But in 409 B.C. the Carthaginian menace again cast its shadow over the island. A huge Carthaginian fleet swooped down on the Sicilian coast and landed an army of mercenaries who destroyed two Greek cities, butchered the male inhabitants, and sailed back to Carthage in triumph with thousands of captive Greek women and tons of loot. Three years later another Greek city in Sicily was destroyed in the same savage fashion. All western Sicily was falling into Carthaginian hands.

Times of peril, such as this, often give birth to usurpers and dictators, because people feel the need for a strong military leader. Syracuse, strong, wealthy, and democratic, lost confidence in her politicians, who had failed to defend western Sicily against the invader. Profiting by this turn of public opinion, an unscrupulous

[1] See pp. 179–181.

young army officer, Dionysius (dī′ŏ-nĭsh′ĭ-ŭs), made himself tyrant of Syracuse (405 B.C.). First he made certain of his own power by erecting for himself a frowning castle and by hiring a guard of mercenary soldiers. Then he built a massive wall around Syracuse and constructed an imposing fleet of over three hundred warships. He organized an army of 80,000 men, much stronger than any force that Athens or Sparta had ever been able to put into the field. Prepared for war, Dionysius could now challenge Carthage. He even dared demand that Carthage should withdraw entirely from Sicily. So extreme a demand he could not enforce; but he did reconquer from Carthage and add to his own realm all except the western tip of Sicily.

In the intervals between his wars with Carthage, he extended his power into Italy, conquering the whole toe of the Italian boot. Still farther he reached out, to found settlements on the Adriatic coast and control the Adriatic trade, and also to establish his power in the islands of Corsica and Elba.

Under his dictatorship Syracuse was becoming the center of a mid-Mediterranean empire. Dionysius was both bloody and unscrupulous in building his empire; he imposed crushing burdens of taxation on his subjects; he outraged the pious by his seizure of sacred treasures from temples of the gods; and he created intense resentment by giving the estates of Greek aristocrats and the lands of ruined Greek cities to emancipated slaves and non-Greek mercenaries. His policy was to use in his army the hardy non-Greek natives of Sicily and Italy, instead of relying entirely on the more highly civilized Greeks. He deliberately followed a policy of blending Hellene and Barbarian. Such measures, however, made his tyranny as unpopular as it was magnificent, and soon after his death (367 B.C.) the empire collapsed, leaving Sicily once more disunited.

Spartan Supremacy in the East. — Turning back to the eastern Greeks, we find Sparta after the Peloponnesian War the supreme military power. For a third of a century (404 B.C. to 371 B.C.) Spartan militarism was triumphant. Most of the city-states of the Greek Peninsula were in the position of dependent allies or vassals. Greece was almost unified. Yet Sparta failed.

Oligarchies. — One important reason was that the Spartan military oligarchy insisted on installing oligarchies in Athens and other dependent cities, in place of the democracies that had hitherto existed outside the Peloponnesian League. This interference with the cherished right of each city to conduct its own local politics was a sure method of arousing hatred of Sparta among the people.

Persia and Sparta. — Another reason was Persia. During the Peloponnesian War, Sparta had accepted the aid, especially the gold, offered by Cyrus, younger son of the Persian King. In return, Sparta aided him in his attempt to seize the Persian throne from his elder brother. With thirteen thousand hired Greek soldiers, and a larger number of Asiatics, Cyrus marched toward Persia, but was killed in battle near Babylon, and the Greek soldiers had to fight their way home through a hostile country.[1] This adventure may have shown the Greeks how weak the Persian Empire really was, but it also started a war between that Empire and Sparta.

While a Spartan king led twenty thousand men across the Ægean, hoping to wrest a large part of Asia Minor from Persia, the latter encouraged rebellion against Sparta in Greece. Corinth, Thebes, Argos, and Athens revolted. An Athenian accepted the office of admiral for Persia, and led the Phœnician fleet to victories against the Peloponnesian fleet. With Persian gold the Long Walls of Athens and the fortified harbor of the Piræus were rebuilt. Once more Athens became the leader of a powerful confederacy.

Hard pressed by her foes, Sparta made peace with Persia in the year 386 B.C. By the peace terms, known as "the King's Peace" (or the Peace of Antalcidas), the Greek cities of Asia Minor were handed over to Persia, while the other Greek cities were to be independent. In appearance Sparta had preserved her leadership. But the terms forced on Athens, Corinth, and Thebes by Persia with Spartan assistance made Spartan leadership of Hellas a bitter mockery.

Theban Victories. — Inevitably rebellion followed, first by Thebes, then also by Athens and other states. It was Thebes that struck the fatal blow at Spartan hegemony. The Thebans had

[1] Their march is described in Xenophon's *Anabasis*.

improved their army, and especially their cavalry. In Epaminondas (ē-păm′ĭ-nŏn′dăs) they had a military genius as their leader. Epaminondas revolutionized the art of warfare by concentrating his strength against a vital point in the enemy line, instead of fighting the battle all along the front. In the battle of Leuctra (lūk′trȧ, 371 B.C.) he hurled a Theban column, fifty ranks deep, against the Spartan line, twelve deep. Of course the Spartan line was broken by the sheer momentum of the massed attack. Four hundred Spartans, including one of the Spartan kings, fell on the field. The number may seem small, but it was about a fourth of the Spartan aristocracy. There were only about a thousand left to provide the backbone for future Lacedæmonian armies of periœci and helots. Worse was to follow. Epaminondas with forty thousand men invaded the Peloponnesus and liberated the Messenian helots from Sparta, giving them the western and most productive part of the country.

Thebes now took Sparta's place as the leading state in eastern Hellas, but not for long. Against Theban supremacy Athens, Sparta, and various other states joined forces. In the great battle of Mantinea (măn′tē-nē′yȧ) that was to decide the issue, Epaminondas repeated his novel tactics, but in the hour of victory he was wounded to the death (362 B.C.). With Epaminondas expired the hopes of Thebes.

Effect of Chronic Wars. — In these chronic wars the city-states of the Greek Peninsula were bleeding themselves white and exhausting their manhood. The rivalry of city-states had hitherto been the great stimulus of Greek civilization; it had been the spur of competition even in athletic contests among rival cities. But in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., the spur had become a sword; competition had become chronic war. Not until Philip of Macedon conquered the Greek Peninsula, in 338 B.C., were the wars among the Greek cities checked, and then it was not for long.

Political and Social Changes. — Before passing on to the story of Macedonian conquests, we should pause to take note of the political, social and economic, artistic and intellectual changes that were occurring during the fourth century, before the end of Greek independence.

Mercenary Armies. — For example, the old idea that a state's army should consist of its own patriotic citizens was disappearing, and in many Greek states the citizens were getting into the habit of hiring mercenary troops to fight their wars, because wars now lasted many years instead of a single summer, as of old, and few citizens could or would spend most of their lives campaigning.

The "Demagogues." — In politics the proud old families of aristocratic ancestry no longer monopolized the chief offices. Leaders were arising from among the common people and catering to the desires of the masses. In democratic governments the most powerful leaders were the most eloquent orators, who could stir up the people's emotions. The "demagogues," as the popular politicians were called, often sought to please the masses at the expense of the wealthier classes.

Economic Problems. — Economic changes help to explain these political tendencies. The poor had strong reasons for discontent. On one hand, they saw the rich enjoying luxuries unknown in the past and building splendid houses which would formerly have been considered suitable for gods rather than for men. They also saw the upper classes devoting less of their time and wealth to public affairs, and more to pleasure or profit. On the other hand, the poor found that the cost of living was rising. Higher prices were due in part to the fact that the silver mines of Attica and other countries had increased the amount of coinage in circulation. The purchasing power of money shrank as the quantity expanded. Another cause of high prices was the fact that Athens and many another Greek state had become more and more dependent upon fish and grain imported at great expense from distant lands such as Scythia (Russia) and Egypt. Moreover, merchants often attempted to corner the market and raise prices. Such financial speculations were all the easier because now there were bankers who received money on deposit and lent it out to merchants at interest.

Growth of Slavery. — Another important change was the constant growth of slavery. In fourth-century Athens, slaves constituted considerably more than half the population. Rich men increased their wealth by employing slaves in agriculture or in

shops producing manufactures. Consequently free workers found it more difficult to obtain employment. Also, as most manual labor was now performed by slaves, it was despised by the upper classes, and the gulf widened between work and wealth.

Hellenic Culture in the Fourth Century B.C.

The New Spirit in Art. — Art, as well as politics and economics, reflected the changes that were coming over Greek life. The old restraint and severity melted into grace and freedom. Sculptors and architects were no longer employed to such a large extent for work on temples. Instead, they spent more of their time constructing or adorning private houses, tombs, and theaters.

Statue of Hermes by Praxiteles

Sculpture.—Perhaps that is one reason why more statues of living men were made, and fewer of the gods. Even the gods were made more human. Praxiteles (prăk-sĭt′ē-lēz), the most gifted Athenian sculptor of the fourth century, preferred to chisel very human figures of Hermes (Mercury) and Aphrodite (Venus), the types of masculine and feminine beauty,

rather than the stiffly armored Athena or the solemn Olympian Zeus. The beautiful statue of Hermes by Praxiteles is no majestic god, but a slender, handsome young man, lounging in an easy attitude of repose. Praxiteles and his contemporaries also showed greater technical skill in portraying not only the general structure of the body, but such details as hair, muscular anatomy, and the texture of cloth draperies. In short, sculpture became less dignified and more realistic, less religious and more human.

Painting. — The same century gave birth to painters who are said to have eclipsed all previous achievements. Of their pictures, however, little can be said, because very few ancient paintings have been well preserved.[1]

Building. — Architects of this period erected larger and more lavishly decorated buildings. Earlier Greek temples as a rule had been relatively small and remarkably simple in design — one-storied oblong buildings with rows of columns or pillars at the ends or on all four sides. Such buildings, of which the Parthenon is the finest example, depended for their beauty upon their harmony and simplicity and upon the sculpture and painting with which they were adorned, rather than upon size or elaborate design. The style of column most frequently used before the fourth century was known as the "Doric Order"; it was rather plain and heavy, but exquisitely proportioned and delicately tapering toward the top. In the fourth century, however, most architects preferred the "Ionic Order," which had grown up among the Ionian cities of Asia Minor. Ionic columns were more slender and did not taper; they had ornamental bases, and the capital at the top of each Ionic column was ornamented with graceful scrolls. A third style, which began to win favor in the fourth century and became most popular in later centuries, was the "Corinthian Order," with taller columns and richly carved capitals of acanthus leaves. The illustration on the next page shows the differences among the three orders.

[1] Except paintings on vases, of which a great number are now treasured in museums. A number of Greek paintings were copied, often in mosaic, on the walls of houses in Pompeii and Herculaneum, and some of these have been preserved. Paintings have been found in Egypt, too; but it is still true that most of the great Hellenic painting is lost.

Literature in Transition. — Literature, too, was in transition. The four great dramatists of the fifth century — Æschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, and Aristophanes — had made Athens the home of the theater. In the fourth century Athens continued to produce dramatists. But the two points of special interest here are, first, that the drama had become less a matter of religious solemnity and more a matter of very human emotions, condescending to



THE "ORDERS" OF GREEK ARCHITECTURE — DORIC, IONIC, AND CORINTHIAN
From C. H. Weller, *Athens and Its Monuments*

poke fun at the politicians and fads of the day, and, second, that theaters were being built in other cities. By the end of the century we find theaters in the larger Hellenic cities all over the civilized Mediterranean world, and companies of Greek actors performing not only the classics of the preceding century but many new plays. The theater had become a characteristic feature of Greek city life.

Oratory. — The highest development of Greek oratory came in the fourth century, just as the Greek cities were about to lose their independence. As we have suggested on an earlier page, the

Athenian system of large juries and popular government encouraged the development of public speaking. The same thing happened at Syracuse. Ambitious young men often spent several years receiving instruction from a professional teacher of rhetoric and public speaking, in order to be equipped for legal and political affairs. Such training, it must be remarked, was not merely in superficial eloquence, but in the fundamental principles of politics, the lessons of history, and the literary culture with which an orator might enrich his speech.

Demosthenes. — Greatest of all orators was Demosthenes (dē-mŏs'thē-nēz, 384–322 B.C.). Born of a wealthy family, but defrauded of his fortune by his guardians, and brought up as a weakling without the customary athletic training, Demosthenes set his heart and his will to the aim of becoming an orator. In later ages many a story was told about his persistence — how he spoke with pebbles in his mouth in order to improve his defective enunciation, how he shouted against the noise of the waves in order to strengthen his voice. He studied under the greatest teacher of oratory and law. Thanks to genius, perseverance, and a good teacher, he was able to win his suit against the dishonest guardians who had taken his inheritance, and he fairly leaped into fame. He became a professional writer of speeches for men who were involved in lawsuits. More than that, his eloquence and his knowledge of politics and history made him the leading statesman of Athens. With matchless power of word and argument he tried to reawaken the old public spirit in Athens; he denounced the

DEMOSTHENES

corruption and indifference that were invading political life; he urged Athens to stand as the leader and champion of the Greeks against the Barbarians, particularly against the Macedonians, who were conquering the Greek Peninsula in his day. His most famous orations, though perhaps not his best, were the "Philippics," the series of speeches in which he urged Athens to resist the encroachments of King Philip of Macedon. The Philippics failed, Greece was conquered, and Demosthenes in the end became a fugitive from his well-loved city — a fugitive who preferred suicide to captivity. His political career, then, was a tragic failure; but his fame as an orator has grown with each passing century.

Religious Beliefs Challenged. — The most remarkable progress was made during the fourth century in science, philosophy, and ethics. One reason for this advance was the fact that the Greeks had been coming more and more into contact with the older civilizations of Egypt and Western Asia. Not only did the Greeks obtain much knowledge in this way, but also their curiosity was stimulated by the differences between their own ideas and beliefs and those of foreigners. Thoughtful Greeks, then, were led on to form new theories in the hope of finding some more satisfactory explanation of the world and of life itself.

Scientific Theorizing. — One direction which this theorizing took was an attempt to explain the world in terms of a few simple elements or principles. In a way, this attempt reminds one of modern chemistry and physics, for it sought to discover the elements of matter and the laws that govern their combinations. But without microscopes or other scientific instruments, the Greeks could not get far along this line. A typical Greek theory, popular in the fifth and fourth centuries, was that all things are made of four elements — Hot, Cold, Wet, and Dry (Fire, Air, Water, and Earth); Love and Strife were the active principles that made these elements combine and separate. Dissatisfied with such theories, some philosophers declared that instead of four elements, there were really an infinite number of atoms, too small to be visible, and that these atoms combined to form all substances and even to make up the soul of man. On the other hand, one cele-

brated teacher declared that Hot and Cold, Wet and Dry, were not separate things but different degrees of the same qualities.

Astronomy and Mathematics. — In various specialized fields, however, science could advance farther. In astronomy the Greeks had not only predicted eclipses but explained their causes. The notion that the earth, sun, and moon are spherical was becoming fairly common among the educated classes. Since the days of Thales arithmetic and geometry had been carried very far in the hands of the Pythagoreans (pĭ-thăg′ŏ-rē′ăns) — the followers of the sixth-century philosopher Pythagoras (pĭ-thăg′ŏ-răs). While they regarded numbers as having a peculiar mystical meaning, and studied mathematics for its own sake rather than for its value in the practical concerns of everyday life, the Pythagoreans discovered most of the facts that are taught to-day in elementary geometry.



NIOBE: AN EXAMPLE OF GREEK SCULPTURE IN THE FOURTH CENTURY

Medicine. — Much more practical was the science of medicine as developed in the late fifth and early fourth centuries by Hippocrates (hĭ-pŏk′rȧ-tēz, 460–377 B.C.), the "Father of Medicine." Though he was handicapped by a lack of chemical knowledge and

by the fact that in his day it was not considered right to dissect dead bodies, yet he put his practice on a sound scientific basis. "Every illness has a natural cause," so he declared, and accordingly he sought natural remedies, such as rules of hygiene, dieting, drugs, and in severe cases surgery and bloodletting.

The Sophists. — While these developments of natural science continued to arouse interest, more attention was paid to philosophy, political science, and ethics in the fourth century. Attention was directed to these subjects by the teachers who travelled about from one country to another, training young men in the art of oratory and in such knowledge as a public speaker ought to possess regarding government, law, society, morals, and religion. Because they claimed to be teachers of wisdom (*sophia*) these men were often called Sophists (sŏf′ĭsts). The word has an unfavorable meaning to-day, and is applied to persons who use ingenious arguments to prove assertions that are really untrue. But it would be unfair to regard the Greek Sophists as nothing more than insincere debaters. They were the world's first professional teachers of political and social science, as well as of eloquence.

Socrates. — The tendency to pay more attention to legal, political, and ethical questions than to natural science was very characteristic of the Sophists, but it became even more marked in Socrates (sŏk′rȧ-tēz, 469–399 B.C.). Socrates was not a professional teacher working for pay. He may best be described as a seeker after truth. Day after day he walked and taught in the Athenian market place, questioning and teaching rich and poor alike. Superficially he was not a figure to attract admiration — stout, bald, poorly dressed, with protruding eyes and snub nose. But many Athenians discovered under this unattractive exterior the mind of a genius.

In his youth Socrates had studied the various ideas about natural science, but he turned against them because they informed him only *how* and not *why* things happened. His interest was in men's ideas rather than in natural science. What is justice? What is love? Why is a thing beautiful? Such were the questions he asked. Though he claimed that the only thing he knew was his own ignorance, Socrates managed by his skillful questioning to

lead his listeners from one argument to another until they could see for themselves the ideas he desired to teach. His searching questions must have made many conservative Athenians uneasy, and others indignant, particularly when he touched on the subject of religion. Indeed, we are told that Socrates was condemned for "corrupting the youth," and sentenced to death. The charge may have been due to political and personal enmities, and it was probably unjust, but Socrates calmly drank the cup of hemlock poison which ended his quest of truth.



SOCRATES

Plato. — His teachings lived on, however, in the minds of his pupils, of whom the greatest was Plato (plā′tō, 427–347 B.C.). As a rich Athenian youth, of good family and brilliant natural gifts, Plato would have plunged into Athenian political life, in all probability, had not the teaching of Socrates interested him in the pursuit of wisdom. Possibly the condemnation of Socrates by Athens disgusted Plato with the Athenian government. At any rate, Plato was extremely pessimistic about Greek democracy. In his most famous book, "The Republic," he pictured an ideal state, in which the ignorant masses would be governed by highly educated philosophers.

Being familiar with the natural sciences of his day (especially arithmetic, astronomy, and geometry), and with the attempts of previous philosophers to explain the nature of things, Plato put forward the interesting theory that the things we see and feel are

but faint copies of perfect and eternal Ideas (or Forms), which can be known only through the mind, not through the senses. And the greatest of these Ideas is God, Creator of the universe. The old poetic myths about Zeus, Apollo, Aphrodite, and other gods seemed immoral and childish to Plato's mind. They might do for the common people, but not for philosophers.



PLATO

The Academy. — One of Plato's most important achievements was the founding of a school or college in his home, on the outskirts of Athens. As it was near the public park called the Academy, the school was known as the Academy. To attend Plato's lectures students flocked to the Academy from all over the Greek world, and carried back to their homes the influence of the great Athenian thinker.

Aristotle. — One of Plato's pupils was Aristotle (ăr′ĭs-tŏt′l, 384–322 B.C.), who came to Athens at the age of eighteen, from the distant city of Stagira (stȧ-jī′rȧ) in Macedonia. He remained long after he had learned all Plato had to teach. And after Plato's death, he founded a new school which took its name from the Lyceum, the recreation park or gymnasium in which he walked and talked with his pupils. His followers were also called "Peri-

patetics" (pĕr′ĭ-pȧ-tĕt′ĭks = walkers) because Aristotle so often walked as he taught them.

Aristotle's claim to fame may be primarily based on his contributions to philosophy, but he was not merely a philosopher. He was a walking university. He lectured on a dozen or more subjects. He wrote books (or perhaps we should say he wrote rolls of papyrus) on astronomy, on the soul, on the senses, on memory, on dreams, on zoölogy, on botany, on mechanics, on virtues and vices, on rhetoric, on oratory, on politics, on poetry and art. He could hardly have accomplished all this single-handed. Pupils and assistants aided him in collecting information. Once the facts had been gathered, Aristotle's mind was not content until he had classified them, organized them, and thought out principles to explain them.

ARISTOTLE

His greatness was not merely in his breadth of knowledge, but also in his logical treatment of the many topics that interested him. Indeed, he worked out the rules of logic, that is to say, of correct thinking, so carefully that logic became a regular subject

of instruction. His views on philosophy and on the nature of existence can hardly be explained here, but it may at least be said that Aristotle not only enjoyed fame in his own lifetime, but was venerated as "*the* philosopher" more than a thousand years afterwards, and his works are still read with admiration by many students of philosophy.

Summary. — We may conclude that although the fourth century witnessed the political decline and finally the conquest of the Greek city-states, weakened by incessant wars and by the decline of the old public spirit, the same period bore rich fruit in painting, sculpture, and architecture, in literature, in medicine and mathematics, and in philosophy. Greek civilization was growing vigorously. It was outgrowing the old Greek city-state. The purpose of the next two sections will be to show how the confining walls of the city-state were broken down, and how Greek civilization then expanded freely into the larger realm that was won by the soldiers of Alexander the Great.

The Empire of Alexander the Great

Rise of Macedonia. — The Greek city-states were conquered by a nation of which almost nothing had been heard before the middle of the fourth century — Macedonia. The Greeks had considered it a "barbarian" country, backward and rude. But the Macedonia that became master of Greece was far from barbarism. Its people spoke Greek and had learned enough from the more civilized Greeks to conquer them. And when Macedonia established a world Empire, it was Greek culture that prevailed in the Empire.

Macedonia learned the art of war from Thebes. A young Macedonian prince, Philip by name, was taken as hostage to Thebes, and held there three years, at the very time that Thebes was the most powerful military state in Greece. Philip admired the culture and wealth of the Thebans, but above all he observed their army. When he returned to become King of Macedonia, as an eighteen-year-old monarch, he organized the Macedonian shepherds and farmers into a military phalanx on the Theban model. He introduced, however, several improvements such as giving his phalanx of infantrymen longer spears (twenty-four feet

long!) and strengthening his cavalry so that it could deliver the decisive blow and annihilate a defeated enemy.

With this superior army, and with a plentiful supply of gold from mines in Thrace, Philip proceeded to enlarge his kingdom. At the outset Macedonia was merely a rough land of hills and valleys at the northwestern corner of the Ægean Sea, north of the Greek state of Thessaly, and cut off from the sea by colonies of other Greek states. Philip, however, conquered these colonies, and Thessaly, and Thrace.

Philip's Victory over the Greeks. — To oppose Macedonian encroachments Demosthenes stirred up Athenian patriotism, and persuaded Athens to put herself at the head of a federation of Greek cities. The Athenian and allied armies, however, were no match for Philip's improved fighting machine. They were badly defeated in the decisive battle of Chæronea (kĕr′ŏ-nē′ȧ, 338 B.C.).

A few generations ago historians regarded the battle of Chæronea as the end of Greek independence and of the really important part of Greek history. As a matter of fact, it marked the beginning of the great expansion of Greek culture, and it did not completely end Greek independence, for the Greek cities were still allowed to govern themselves. What it did end was Greek disunity, — and that only for a short time. The victorious Macedonian compelled the Greek cities (excepting Sparta and the Greek cities of Sicily and Italy) to form a Hellenic League, with a federal congress in which each state was represented according to its population. The League was bound to him in an offensive and defensive alliance, and of course he was commander-in-chief.

United under Macedonian leadership, the Greeks were a really great power, for their combined army included 200,000 first-class infantrymen and 15,000 cavalry. With a portion of his Græco-Macedonian army, Philip prepared to launch an invasion of Asia Minor, but before he could achieve his ambitious plans of Asiatic conquests he was murdered.

Alexander the Great. — The throne and — what was more important — the army of the murdered Macedonian King were inherited by Alexander, twenty years old, daring, gifted, and romantic. The young prince was Macedonian by ancestry, but

by education he had been Hellenized. His tutor was none other than Aristotle, the most famous of all Greek philosophers. So warm was young Alexander's admiration for Greek culture that he dreamed of Hellenizing the world.

Such ambitions were characteristic of his romantic temperament. He regarded the Homeric warrior Achilles as his hero and his ancestor, and fiercely he desired to perform deeds of which even Achilles might well have been proud. The story of the Gordian knot may or may not be true, but it typifies Alexander's pride and ambition. The story was that whoever could untie the knot that held the yoke to the shaft of a certain ancient cart at Gordium would become King of Asia. Alexander tried in vain, but where others might have given up the task, he drew his sword and cut the knot. And he did become King of Asia, thanks to his sword.



ALEXANDER THE GREAT

The young King could be ruthlessly cruel, as well as ambitious. Shortly after he came to the throne, the Greek city of Thebes rebelled. In vengeance he sold the inhabitants as slaves and demolished the entire city, with the exception of the temples and the house of the poet Pindar. The two exceptions were significant. Alexander made it a rule to pay honor to the gods of conquered

peoples. And by sparing Pindar's house he showed respect for the Greek culture of which he made himself the champion.

Alexander's Invasion of Asia. — Quite in line with this policy was his action in laying a wreath on the supposed tomb of Achilles, near Troy, before he started his invasion of Asia. He wished to appear as the new Achilles. It was a daring enterprise, invading the Persian Empire with only thirty or forty thousand soldiers. Yet it succeeded. In the first pitched battle he routed the army



BATTLE OF ISSUS

An ancient Greek Mosaic, representing the defeat of the Persians by Alexander the Great.

that had been gathered together by the Persian satraps of Asia Minor. He could then liberate from Persian rule the Greek cities of Ionia, while at the same time he could add the provinces of the interior to his own realm.

Then he marched south toward Syria, hoping to destroy the Phœnician cities whose navies gave Persia command of the seas. In northern Syria he was met by the Persian Emperor, Darius III, and again the Macedonian and Greek troops proved their superiority, on the famous field of Issus (333 B.C.). The defeated

Emperor offered young Alexander half his Empire. But Alexander intended to take more than half. He besieged and captured the Phœnician seaports, and soon was master of all Syria and Palestine.

Alexander in Egypt. — From Syria he continued his triumphal march into Egypt, which had long been discontented under Persian rule. In Egypt he revealed his intention of making himself an oriental despot. One of the characteristics of oriental despotism for the past three thousand years or more had been that the monarch was regarded as a god. Alexander made himself Pharaoh of Egypt, but he went even farther. At an oasis out in the desert west of the Nile there was an oracle of the Egyptian god Amon, whom the Greeks identified with their own god Zeus, and to whose utterances the whole Greek world at this period paid great reverence. To this oasis Alexander went, and the priests of Zeus-Amon hailed the young Macedonian as son of the god. This was pleasing to Alexander's boundless pride, and at the same time it was a shrewd political move, for it made many pious persons both in Egypt and in Greece look upon him as more than an ordinary mortal ruler. Finding Egypt a pleasant place in which to spend the winter with his army, Alexander lingered on the banks of the Nile, but not idly. At his command a new city sprang up in the Delta, a city which he intended to become a great seaport and a center of Hellenic culture in Egypt. You can still find it on the map with the name he gave it — Alexandria.

Conquest of Persia. — As soon as spring made the Syrian mountains less forbidding, Alexander led his army out of Egypt, across Syria, and on toward the east. Not until he reached the Tigris, near Nineveh, did he meet the Persian army, arrayed in full strength to preserve the greatest Empire the world had known, an Empire two centuries old. Elephants and chariots, horsemen and infantry, archers and spearmen in overwhelming strength were drawn up on the plain of Arbela (är-bē′lȧ, 331 B.C.) to crush the young Macedonian invader. By skill and daring, however, Alexander threw the enormous Persian host into disorder, and defeated it so signally that Darius had to flee from the field. The Persian Empire was now defenseless. Almost without opposition

THE EMPIRE OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT, ABOUT 325 B.C.

Alexander entered the ancient city of Babylon and paid lip-service to its venerable gods. At Susa and Persepolis (pēr-sĕp′ŏ-lĭs), two capitals of Persia, he seized the enormous state treasure of silver and coined it into money. Always with an eye to theatrical gestures that would impress popular imagination, he himself threw a lighted torch into the royal palace at Persepolis, to show that the old Empire was destroyed.

Invasion of India. — Hardly had Alexander installed loyal generals to take charge of the vast Empire already conquered than he set out once more with his army, this time to invade India, doubtless because he knew of India's great wealth. The Persians, before him, had obtained heavy tribute from India. Conquering the northwestern part of this huge country, he founded cities and planted garrisons to maintain his power there. He might have gone on to conquer all of India, had not his weary soldiers found the climate intolerable and complained so bitterly that he turned back. Even so, he had pushed his Empire farther than that of any previous conqueror had extended. Moreover, his invasion of India brought that country into touch with the Near East, and thenceforth there was more trade between India and Mesopotamia and Asia Minor. India was brought thus under Near Eastern influence, and in turn India affected European civilization.[1]

The Last Journey. — Having returned to Susa in Persia, Alexander with restless energy organized a fleet to sail round Arabia. He had already sent one of his admirals, Nearchus (nē-är′kŭs) of Crete, to sail from the mouth of the Indus River and to discover a water route to Babylonia — which meant, of course, coasting along the northern shores of the Arabian Sea and the Persian Gulf to the Tigris. Now Alexander planned to sail with Nearchus on a new voyage of discovery, starting at Babylon to find a route around Arabia to Egypt, and conquering Arabia en route. Just before he was to sail, he indulged in one of the drunken debauches to which he was addicted. Weakened by wounds, and by hard marches through hot lands, and by heavy drinking, he fell sick. One by one his Macedonian veterans were allowed to pass through his bedchamber, to catch a last glimpse of the young man — now in

[1] See pp. 384–388.

his thirty-third year — who in twelve years had conquered a large part of the civilized world. He was taking his departure, in that summer of the year 323 B.C., not for a cruise around Arabia, but for a longer voyage of discovery, and not by land or by sea.

Alexander and Hellenism. — Alexander was more than a military conqueror. He started out at the age of twenty, apparently, with the idea of using the Græco-Macedonian army to spread Greek culture throughout the civilized world. Everywhere he

ANOTHER FAMOUS EXAMPLE OF GREEK SCULPTURE, "THE DYING GAUL"

founded Greek cities, such as Alexandria in Egypt; according to Plutarch, more than seventy such centers of Greek civilization were established in Alexander's twelve years of kingship. Greek temples, Greek theaters, Greek art and literature, Greek commerce, and Greek colonists were thus spread out over the Empire.

Plans for Union of East and West. — The years, however, that Alexander spent in Asia, never returning to Macedon or to Greece, somewhat altered his plans. He became partly easternized. Superficially this was seen in his wearing the soft clothing of the

Persians, and adopting a Persian diadem and scepter, and surrounding his court with Persian splendor. He made all men who approached his presence kneel at his feet and kiss the dust, as was the custom in Asia. Like other oriental despots he claimed to be a god, and insisted on being given divine honors. But he went still farther. Why not blend East and West? He himself married Persian princesses. He persuaded many of his officers, and ten thousand of his Macedonian soldiers, to marry Asiatic wives, and to celebrate this wholesale wedding of East and West he gave a splendid nuptial feast. With the same end in view, he gave orders that thirty thousand Persian boys should be taught the Greek language and Macedonian military tactics, so that he could use them to replace worn-out Macedonian and Greek veterans. He planned to transplant Asiatics into Europe, as well as Greeks into Asia. He intended to include Carthage and all the shores of the Mediterranean in his realm. To Alexander the world was a melting-pot in which he was blending Greek culture, Macedonian militarism, and Asiatic man-power into one great Empire.

Break-up of the Empire. — Had Alexander lived long enough to organize his Empire thoroughly, and to leave it to a grown son, perhaps it would have lasted, and his ideas might have been more completely realized. His son, however, was born after he died, and his half-witted brother could not govern successfully. Alexander's generals became the real power behind the half-vacant throne. And soon the generals quarreled and fought with one another. The Empire was broken up, and, after a series of wars, three kingdoms emerged — (1) Macedonia, (2) Egypt, and (3) Western Asia. The last-named is often called the Kingdom of the Seleucids (sē-lū′sĭds), because its kings were descendants of the general Seleucus.

Hellenistic Civilization

The Hellenized World. — Although his military Empire fell to pieces soon after his death, Alexander's vision of a Hellenized world was in large measure realized. Hellenic (Greek) culture and business accompanied Alexander in his conquests, and their victories were more permanent than the successes of the Macedonian

phalanx. The kingdoms into which his Empire disintegrated were ruled by Græco-Macedonian kings eager to foster Hellenic civilization. Macedonia claimed to be a Greek state, posing as leader and champion of the peninsular Greeks, and protecting them against barbarian invasions from the Danube Valley. The Seleucid dynasty, ruling the lands from Asia Minor to the Indian borderlands, protected the Græco-Macedonian cities which Alexander had planted as centers of Hellenism in Asia. Even Egypt, so far as the upper classes were concerned, was Hellenized.

Greek Culture Transplanted. — The glory of the old Greek states such as Athens and Sparta was declining, while Corinth as a commercial center and occasional residence of the Macedonian king became the chief of the cities in the peninsula. But new cities were arising in splendor and wealth — Alexandria at the mouth of the Nile, Pergamum in Asia Minor, Antioch in Syria, and Rhodes on its island off the Asia Minor coast.

THE WINGED VICTORY OF SAMOTHRACE

In these cities Greek art and literature, Greek drama and philosophy, transplanted from the older towns, flourished with all the exuberant vigor that so often is gained by transplanting. Greek dramas were performed in scores of cities in Africa and Asia. It was in Egypt that the classics of Greek literature were preserved, cherished, and edited. While students of Homer and other ancients were making the study of literature a very learned profession, other literary men were writing poems and dramas

dealing with the life of the common people, with romantic legends, and with love-stories — themes that had not often attracted the older writers. Masterpieces of Greek architecture, sculpture, and painting were achieved in Pergamum, in Rhodes, in Alexandria, in Antioch. Some critics believe the Aphrodite of Melos (Venus de Milo) belongs to this period. The beautiful Nike (Victory) of Samothrace and the Apollo Belvedere were carved in the generation after Alexander. The celebrated figure of Laocoön and his two sons writhing in the clutch of the serpents was the work of Rhodian sculptors in the first century B.C. Painting flourished, and in Egypt Greek artists were learning to copy paintings in more permanent mosaics of colored stone. Some critics prefer the austerity and dignity of fifth-century Athenian art to the emotion, the violent action, and often the pain depicted in these later works; but that is a matter of taste, and from the historian's point of view the fact to be noted is that, in this period after Alexander, Greek art was more widespread, more luxuriant, less restricted by conventions, and more realistic in reproducing the human body.

The "Hellenistic" Age. — In its expansion throughout the civilized world Hellenic civilization ceased to be purely Hellenic. It could not fail to be influenced by its new surroundings. In Egypt it was blended with things Egyptian, in Syria it became partly Semitic. It was a cosmopolitan culture in which Hellenism was the chief ingredient. By historians it is usually labelled "Hellen*istic*," and perhaps that is as good a name as any. Hellenistic civilization flourished in Egypt and the other lands around the eastern Mediterranean for several centuries after Alexander. The period of almost three centuries between Alexander and the Roman conquest of Egypt (that is, from 323 to 30 B.C.) is known as the "Hellenistic Age" in the Near East.[1]

Hellenistic Egypt. — Egypt was singularly prominent in the Hellenistic world. Ptolemy (tŏl′ē-mĭ), one of Alexander's ablest

[1] The Near East was largely Hellenized so far as the upper classes were concerned. The masses, however, continued to speak their native languages and to adhere to their local religions and customs. The common people in Egypt remained Egyptian in speech and ways of life; those in Syria remained Syrian; those in Persia remained Persian; etc.

Macedonian generals, was made satrap of Egypt in the year 323 B.C., and assumed the title of king seventeen years later, thus founding the dynasty of Ptolemies — for each of the kings of his line, for ten or more generations, took the name Ptolemy. The beautiful Cleopatra was the last of the line, and during her reign Egypt once more was conquered, this time by Rome. From Ptolemy I to Cleopatra, however, a period of almost three hundred years, Egypt enjoyed a brilliant revival of wealth, power, and culture. As in the days of the ancient Pharaohs, Egypt again dominated the eastern Mediterranean.

LAOCOÖN

Greek Business Men in Egypt. — The economic revival of Egypt under Græco-Macedonian control was extremely important. Egypt had been one of the richest of Persian provinces, but it became even more of a prize — the granary of the ancient world. For enterprising Greek business men it was the land of opportunity. Why the Greeks were able to gain control of the economic life of Egypt — and of Western Asia too — may be easily explained. They were favored by the Macedonian kings, who considered themselves Greek. They were familiar with money and finance and banking, whereas the Egyptians still

transacted much of their business by the earlier method of barter, without money; and as money came into more general use, naturally the skillful Greeks knew how to take advantage of it. The Greeks also had more highly specialized methods of industry and manufacturing, as well as better scientific technique in building canals, dams, harbors, lighthouses, tunnels. Likewise the Greeks had improved methods of agriculture. They even had books on scientific farming.

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

A Hellenistic Statue of an Old Market Woman

Second century, B.C.

The Greek "gentlemen farmers" who managed large estates in Egypt applied their scientific skill, not only in improving the irrigation system and reclaiming waste lands, but also in increasing the yield per acre. New crops were introduced. Olive trees were planted, and Egypt became an exporter of olive oil. The profitable wine industry was fostered. New breeds of sheep were brought in; new varieties of fruit trees were cultivated. Never before had the black land of the Nile been so productive; never before had it exported such quantities of wheat, oil, and manufactures.

Among the manufactures we should mention especially glass, tapestries and fine linens, perfumes and incense, and papyrus and books. Egypt had a monopoly of papyrus and was therefore the chief producer of books. A book, in those days, was written by hand on a long sheet of papyrus which was rolled on a stick. Egyp-

tian perfumes and incense were manufactured from aromatic gums and herbs imported from Arabia and India. As the home of these and other industries, and as the chief port of the eastern Mediterranean, Alexandria became the economic capital of the Hellenistic world.

Exploitation of the Masses. — When Egypt is called prosperous and wealthy, one should not for a moment be misled into believing that the Egyptians were either. The mass of the Egyptian peasants were virtually serfs. Many of them worked in gangs, tilling the soil under the direction of shrewd and grasping Greeks. The wealth of Egypt was concentrated in the hands of the royal family and of Greek exploiters. To some extent one might say that in the Hellenistic world at large, and not simply in Egypt alone, the masses of the working people were poorer, and the ruling classes were richer, than in previous ages. Money was much more plentiful since Alexander had put into circulation the enormous Persian hoards of precious metals, but the money was in few hands. Prices were much higher than in the fourth century. Wages lagged behind and even fell. Skilled laborers could barely make ends meet, while unskilled labor gained only a starvation wage, and slavery was prevalent everywhere. Debts, mortgages, and taxes formed a crushing burden. It is little wonder that the upper classes lived in fear of social revolution. Even in Alexander's lifetime, before conditions became so grave, we find the Hellenic cities formally agreeing that they would not permit in any city the confiscation of property, the division of the land, the cancellation of debts, or the liberation of slaves for the purpose of revolution. But in the third century the gulf between rich and poor, and the discontent of the masses, became even greater.

Literature. — Nevertheless the wealth of the kings and ruling classes made it possible for culture to flourish. We have already mentioned sculpture, architecture, and painting, although perhaps we have not given a sufficient idea of the munificence with which kings and millionaires patronized art. As for literature, we find the Ptolemies founding a royal library at Alexandria, in which more than half a million books were collected. The Egyptian king also established a Museum (so named in honor of the Muses,

HELLENISTIC KINGDOMS, ABOUT 300 B.C.

the divine patrons of art and literature) at Alexandria. This was an association of scholars and men of science, who were supported by the royal treasury and housed in the royal palace, while they pursued their researches. Some of them studied grammar (including not only what we call grammar but also language and literature), and painstakingly made copies of famous books, such as Homer's epics, always trying to remove errors that had been made by earlier and less careful copyists. To their labors we owe in large part the preservation of ancient Greek literature.

Geography. — The most brilliant and original achievement of the Hellenistic Age was in the field of natural science. Geography had been stimulated by Alexander's campaigns, by voyages of discovery, and by the expansion of commerce. The geographers of the third century not only knew the earth was round, but had a fair idea of its size. Eratosthenes (ĕr′ȧ-tŏs′thē-nēz), a Greek geographer and astronomer who held the position of chief librarian at Alexandria in the third century, computed the circumference of the earth by taking observations of the position of the sun from two different places (Alexandria and Syene, the latter far up the Nile). He arrived at the figure of 28,000 miles, which was nearly one-seventh too large, but it was amazingly accurate considering his lack of precise instruments. He anticipated Columbus by declaring that one could sail across the Atlantic, around the world, to India; but he believed the distance was too great to make such a route practicable.

Astronomy. — Although they knew the earth was a sphere, Hellenistic astronomers generally believed it to be stationary. Still they were puzzled to explain the apparent movements of sun, moon, and stars across the horizon. To solve the problem, one bold Greek scientist, Aristarchus (ăr′ĭs-tär′kŭs) of Samos, in the third century B.C., put forward the theory that the sun is a great deal larger than the earth, and that the earth revolves around the sun and rotates daily on its own axis. Unfortunately, however, he could not persuade his contemporaries to accept his theory. He was too far in advance of his age.

Biology. — The advancement of the sciences of biology, anatomy, and medicine was of incalculable practical value. In the

time of Alexander, Aristotle had begun the scientific study of animals. It is an interesting fact that Alexander in the midst of his campaigns found time to send back to Aristotle at Athens specimens of Asiatic animals and plants. The science of biology (the study of living things) was carried farther in the third century at Alexandria, where the Ptolemies had established a collection of rare animals.

Anatomy. — Moreover, in Egypt the scientist was free to dissect human bodies, as the Egyptians were accustomed to remove the internal organs of the dead for the purpose of embalming. The unwillingness of the Greeks in earlier ages to mutilate human bodies had made it extremely difficult for Greek scientists to discover much about the structure of the body; that is why Aristotle, great as he was, made so many absurd errors on the subject of anatomy and physiology. But at Alexandria dissection and even vivisection were practised, and the result was a remarkable increase of knowledge. One of the most famous Alexandrian writers on anatomy and medicine was Herophilus (hē-rŏf′ĭ-lŭs), in the early third century, who discovered that the arteries conduct blood rather than air, that the mind has its seat in the brain, that sensations are transmitted by the nerves, that the pulse affords a valuable indication of health or sickness.

THE VENUS DE MILO

Euclid's Geometry. — The Hellenistic Age was also famous for mathematics. A Greek by the name of Euclid (ū′klĭd), living

at Alexandria in the early third century, summed up the geometrical knowledge of his day in a textbook of thirteen chapters (or "books", each "book" being a roll of papyrus) — a textbook which has been the basis for the study of geometry for more than two thousand years. The story is told that when Ptolemy the King asked Euclid if there were not some easier method of learning the science, the geometer replied, "There is no royal road to geometry."

Archimedes. — Archimedes of Syracuse was another famous third-century mathematician. Using some of the principles of algebra as well as geometry, he worked out many important theorems. He was particularly interested in trying to measure the circle, the sphere, the cone, and other figures. He calculated that the circumference of a circle must be between $3\frac{10}{71}$ and $3\frac{1}{7}$ times the diameter. He also discovered a number of important principles regarding gravity and the laws of floating bodies. It is said that when asked by the tyrant of Syracuse to discover whether a crown that had been made for the latter was really of pure gold, Archimedes solved the problem by putting the crown and an equal weight of pure gold into a vessel of water, and observing the difference in the amount of water they displaced. It was Archimedes, too, who studied the principle of the lever, by which heavy weights can be moved: "Give me a place to stand," he said, "and I will move the earth." His familiarity with the lever, the screw, and the cogged wheel enabled him to construct a machine with which the Syracusan king alone was able to move a large ship. He invented a machine to hurl heavy missiles against the Romans who besieged Syracuse; and a burning glass (a mirror rather than a lens) with which he is said to have set fire to the Roman fleet; and a pumping engine, to remove water from the hold of a ship.

Lack of Applied Science. — Other inventions were made, such as pumps, water mills, washing machines, door-openers, sundials, and so on. Yet we are surprised not so much by the number of these inventions as by the relatively small extent to which Hellenistic science and invention were applied in manufacturing and in daily life. Some of the leading Greeks were inclined to consider mathematics as a "pure" or abstract science, instead of

applying it to practical purposes. Possibly the cheapness of labor, slave or free, was one reason why the ruling classes did not concern themselves more actively with the invention and use of labor-saving devices.

Religious Blending. — The growth of science was one of the factors in promoting a revolution in religious ideas. As we have already seen, the ancestral religion of the Greeks had been weakened, gradually. When the Greeks came so intimately into contact with Egyptian and Asiatic religions in the Hellenistic Age, they were still more inclined to doubt their old beliefs. In some cases they adopted foreign gods, or blended Greek and foreign religions. Thus in Egypt the worship of Serapis (sē-rā′pĭs) was a strange combination of Greek and Egyptian religions. Many people, apparently, lost faith in all gods except Tyche (tī′kē), the goddess of luck or good fortune. Luck alone seemed to be able to explain the world of rich and poor, of conquests and defeats, into which Alexander's exploits had plunged the Greeks.

Philosophy. — Philosophers, however, sought other explanations of life. Most of them, apparently, were inclined to regard the universe as a mechanical thing, governed by scientific laws, instead of ascribing thunder to Zeus, and storms to Poseidon, and natural phenomena in general to the gods, as their forefathers had done. But there was still the problem of human happiness to solve. Hellenistic philosophers could not hold up as an ideal, as the men of the Periclean age had done, the devotion of the citizen to his city-state, for the city-states had been engulfed in a larger world. New answers had to be found to the eternal question: How shall a man achieve happiness? Three different schools or types of philosophy answered the question in three different ways.

Cynics. — The Cynics (sĭn′iks) accepted the ideas of Antisthenes (ăn-tĭs′thē-nēz) of Athens, a pupil of Socrates. Their most famous spokesman was Diogenes (dī-ŏj′ē-nēz), the philosopher who lived in a tub. Their answer to the riddle of life was simple. The aim of man should be to know himself and to live according to his own nature. This they carried to extremes. Denouncing luxury and comfort, and even cleanliness, as obstacles to freedom and self-knowledge, the Cynics took pride in going about in rags

and tatters, unwashed and unshaven, scorning all that other men desired.

Epicureans. — A somewhat similar answer was given by the Epicureans, the disciples of the Athenian philosopher Epicurus (ĕp′ĭ-kū′rŭs). Accepting the theory that the material universe is made of atoms, and that the soul does not live after death, Epicurus argued that man has no reason to fear future punishment or to hope for reward. The gods, he held, have nothing to do with the affairs of men and the phenomena of nature. Science is useful only in so far as it leads men to accept natural explanations of events, and to disbelieve in the power of the gods. Man's chief aim should be pleasure, and the most perfect pleasure is to be found not in material goods or physical enjoyments, but in freedom from worry and ambition and pain. The way to be rich is not to gain more money, but to have fewer desires and simpler needs. If a man could have barley bread and water, he could be as happy as Zeus, said Epicurus. It was a selfish philosophy, and it robbed life of all hope, all incentive for progress, all generous idealism and effort. Yet for many it seemed the only explanation of a world in which injustice was so prevalent, poverty so appalling, and the old religion so decadent.

Stoics. — The Stoics (stō′ĭks) took their name from the Stoa Poikile (Painted Porch) or colonnade at the Athenian market place, where Zeno (zē′nō) first taught his doctrines. Zeno, it should be noted, was not a Greek, but a Semite by birth. Like the Cynics, he was thoroughly materialistic. Everything, he said, including the soul and God, is material. But he drew a different conclusion. God, he held, is the soul of the universe; and as God is reason, the whole universe is reasonable and good. Virtue, then, consists in being in harmony with reason and nature. Temples and sacrifices, Zeno believed, were unnecessary. Man should simply live in accordance with reason and nature. As all nature is reasonable and good, man should not grieve at supposed misfortunes. One should calmly and serenely accept everything as it comes. The Stoics, it is clear, were like the Cynics and Epicureans in believing the renunciation of eager desires to be a recipe for happiness. But the Stoics did not insist that a man must be poor and filthy in

order to be happy, nor did they require him to give up physical pleasures. Instead, they advised him not to set his heart too much on wealth or pleasure, but to accept wealth and poverty, pain and pleasure, with equal tranquillity.

Two points in the Stoic philosophy (or religion, for it was as much religion as philosophy) should be emphasized. One is monotheism. By their belief in a single Supreme God, the Stoics accustomed the philosophers of the age to the doctrine that was soon to appear in Christianity. The other point is the Stoic belief in human equality. All men, Greek and barbarian, freeman and slave, were equal as human beings. This generous idea was also a point of resemblance between Stoicism and Christianity, and it had a very important influence in coloring the Roman system of law, in a later century, with the principles of human equality and natural rights.[1]

Conclusion. — Here we take leave of the Hellenistic world for a time, in order that we may trace the early history of the Roman people, who were now extending their empire and were eventually to include in it all the older homes of civilization in the Near East. But in closing three facts must be emphasized. First, that the Greeks had more influence on world civilization, and achieved higher triumphs in science and in business, and perhaps in art and philosophy, after the political glory of the Greek city-states had passed away than in the heyday of Athens and Sparta. Second, that the Macedonian conquests enlarged and enriched the "melting-pot" of ancient civilization, by bringing Greece, Egypt, and Western Asia into a close commercial and cultural, though not a permanent political, union. Third, that the Hellenistic civilization of the eastern Mediterranean was ready, in the last century before the Christian era, to provide the expanding Roman Republic with art, with literature, with methods of governing an Empire, with Hellenistic religious and philosophical ideas, with luxury, with grain, and, in sum, with a highly developed intellectual, artistic, and economic civilization.

[1] See pp. 361–362.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. What leagues and other bonds of unity existed among the Greek city-states in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.? What were the reasons for disunity?

2. Describe the career of Dionysius of Syracuse. Compare him with Pisistratus.

3. Why did Spartan leadership of the Greek cities after the Peloponnesian War meet with failure and defeat?

4. What were the effects of chronic wars among the Greek city-states?

5. What economic and social changes occurred in the Greek cities during the fourth century B.C.?

6. Mention some of the intellectual and artistic achievements of the Greeks in the fourth century? Are these sufficient to prove that while the ideal of the city-state may have declined during this century, Greek culture was not in decay?

7. Who were the Sophists?

8. How did Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle differ from the earlier philosophers?

9. In what sense did Philip of Macedon lay the foundations for the Empire of Alexander?

10. Outline the steps by which Alexander the Great established his power over the Near East. How did his Empire compare in extent with that of the ancient Egyptian Pharaohs; with that of the Assyrians; with that of Darius? How long did it last? Was its chief importance political or cultural?

11. By what means and to what extent did Alexander's conquests promote the expansion of Greek civilization?

12. What is meant by the "Hellenistic Age"? "Hellenistic Civilization"? Name and locate six centers of Hellenistic culture.

13. Describe economic conditions in Hellenistic Egypt.

14. What were the most notable achievements of the Hellenistic age in science?

15. What was the "Museum" of Alexandria?

SPECIAL TOPICS

Philip of Macedon. BURY, *History of Greece*, 683–737; BOTSFORD AND SIHLER, *Hellenic Civilization*, 541–548.

Alexander and his conquests. BURY, *History of Greece*, 747–786; HOPKINSON, *Greek Leaders*, 197–222; FERGUSON, *Greek Imperialism*, 116–148; BOTSFORD, *Source-Book of Ancient History*, 276–282; PLUTARCH, *Lives* (Alexander).

The Hellenistic world after Alexander's death. BOTSFORD, *Hellenic History*, 451–473.

Economic conditions and trade in the Hellenistic world. BOTSFORD, *Hellenic History*, 394–410, 471–472; GLOTZ, *Ancient Greece at Work*, 349–361, 362–376; KNIGHT, *Economic History*, I, 44–52; BOTSFORD AND SIHLER, *Hellenic Civilization*, 423–447, 488–522.

Demosthenes. JAMES, *Our Hellenic Heritage*, II, 351–377; HOPKINSON, *Greek Leaders*, 171–196; BOTSFORD AND SIHLER, *Hellenic Civilization*, 530–537; PLUTARCH, *Lives* (Demosthenes).

Socrates. JAMES, *Our Hellenic Heritage*, II, 273–291; DURANT, *Story of Philosophy*, 7–19; VAN HOOK, *Greek Life and Thought*, 227–234.

Plato. DURANT, *Story of Philosophy*, 19–57; JAMES, *Our Hellenic Heritage*, II, 292–303; VAN HOOK, *Greek Life and Thought*, 234–244.

Aristotle. DURANT, *Story of Philosophy*, 58–106; JAMES, *Our Hellenic Heritage*, II, 303–319.

Aristotle's political views. FERGUSON, *Greek Imperialism*, 107–114; BOTSFORD AND SIHLER, *Hellenic Civilization*, 456–468.

Epicurus. HICKS, *Stoic and Epicurean*, 153–197.

Zeno and the Stoics. HICKS, *Stoic and Epicurean*, 3–18.

Hellenistic science. SEDGWICK AND TYLER, *Short History of Science*, ch. v; VAN HOOK, *Greek Life and Thought*, 271–279; BOTSFORD AND SIHLER, *Hellenic Civilization*, 627–654; MAHAFFY, *What Have the Greeks Done for Modern Civilization?* 147–180.

Greek architecture. JAMES, *Our Hellenic Heritage*, II, 440–456.

The march of the 10,000. BURY, *History of Greece*, 517–530.

Dionysius of Syracuse. BURY, *History of Greece*, 639–666; HOPKINSON, *Greek Leaders*, 125–146.

The Ptolemies. FERGUSON, *Greek Imperialism*, 149–182.

The Seleucid Empire. FERGUSON, *Greek Imperialism*, 183–214.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THE TEACHER

BOTSFORD, *Hellenic History*. J. B. BURY, *History of Greece*, 514–836. J. B. BURY and others, *Hellenistic Age*. G. GLOTZ, *Ancient Greece at Work*. D. G. HOGARTH, *Philip and Alexander of Macedon*. W. S. FERGUSON, *Hellenistic Athens*. A. HOLM, *History of Greece* (4 vols.). B. I. WHEELER, *Alexander the Great*. SIR J. P. MAHAFFY, *Empire of the Ptolemise*. MAHAFFY, *Alexander's Empire*. M. ROSTOVTZEFF, *A Large Estate in Egypt in the Third Century B.C.* W. L. WESTERMANN, *Story of the Ancient Nations*. CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY, V.

CONVENIENT SOURCE MATERIALS

BOTSFORD AND SIHLER, *Hellenic Civilization*. LIVINGSTONE, *Pageant of Greece*. PLUTARCH, *Lives* (Demosthenes, Alexander). XENOPHON, *Anabasis*. ARRIAN, *Anabasis*. PLATO, *The Republic*. ARISTOTLE, *Politics*, *Ethics*, and *Poetics*.

PART III

CLASSICAL CIVILIZATION IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE

Introduction

From the birth of the first great civilized kingdoms in Egypt, Babylonia, and Crete down to the break-up of Alexander's Empire, we have covered a period of more than three thousand years. We have seen the most ancient civilization of the Near East, especially the civilization of Egypt, transmitted to the Greeks through Crete and later through direct Greek commerce with Egypt; we have watched the Greek city-states raise that civilization to glorious heights, after defending it against the Persian Empire, which was the heir of the ancient Mesopotamian civilizations of Babylonia and Assyria. Alexander, by conquering the Persian Empire, ushered in the Hellenistic Age and the expansion of Greek culture throughout the entire Near East. Hellenistic civilization was primarily a Near Eastern civilization, although it had far-flung outposts on the shores of the Black Sea and on the Mediterranean coasts of Sicily, southern Italy, France, and Spain.

In the next act of the drama, Rome plays the leading rôle. In Chapter VIII we shall see Rome developing, much like any other city-state in the Mediterranean world. But soon Rome conquers all Italy, and in Chapter IX we shall see her bringing together all the lands surrounding the Mediterranean into one great empire. How the conquest of such an empire affected economic conditions and government in Rome, and transformed the Roman Republic into a monarchy, Chapter X explains. Finally, Chapter XI shows how the Roman Empire, taking over the Hellenistic civilization of the Near East and modifying it, spread this classical civilization more extensively in the West — throughout Italy, France, and Spain, and on the northern coasts of Africa.

CHAPTER VIII

THE RISE OF THE ROMAN CITY-STATE

Italy before the Rise of Rome

While Hellenistic civilization was flourishing on the coasts of the eastern Mediterranean, a new power arose in the West. In Italy a warlike city began to fight its way toward world empire. To this rising city-state we must now devote our attention. But in order to understand Rome one should know something of the earlier history of Italy. Accordingly we must turn back, for a moment, to a period long before the time of Alexander and Aristotle.

The Stone Age in Italy. — Many thousands of years ago, there were cave-men in Italy as elsewhere, chipping fist-hatchets out of flint and hunting big game. That was in the Old Stone Age. Thousands of years passed, and the hunters of the Old Stone Age were succeeded by smaller and slighter folk, olive-skinned and dark of hair. These later inhabitants settled down to raising cattle and planting grain. The New Stone Age had come. In Italy it lasted until about 2500 or 2000 B.C. In course of time the people of Italy learned how to use copper, and later bronze. So dawned the Bronze Age.

The Italic Tribes in the Bronze Age. — Then came invaders from the north, descending the Alpine slopes, crossing the Po Valley, and fighting their way southward with well-aimed arrows and keen-edged swords of bronze.[1] Doubtless the invaders mingled and

[1] These invaders are often called the *terremare* people, because they built peculiar villages surrounded by moats and earthen ramparts and divided into blocks by two sets of parallel streets; the houses were built on piles, like the houses of earlier lake-dwellers, but the *terremare* people continued to set their homes up on piles even though their villages were on dry land. In later times the Roman army always made its camps in the same form as the *terremare* settlements.

intermarried with the natives to such an extent that in time they became one people. If we could have travelled through Italy toward the end of the Bronze Age, say about the year 1000 B.C., we should probably have found a good deal of similarity among the different tribes. In the fertile plain of Latium (lā′shĭ-ŭm), between the Apennine Mountains and the sea, just south of the Tiber (tī′bēr) River, we should have found a tribe speaking the Latin tongue that was to become so famous in later ages. The dialects used by other tribes were so closely akin to Latin that we may group them all together as one language — "Italic" (ancient ancestor of the Italian tongue). Among all the Italic tribes we should have found farmers growing wheat and beans, or tending herds of cattle, or pressing grapes into wine, or raising flax for their wives to spin and weave into cloth. We should have found coppersmiths skillful enough to make excellent swords and tools of bronze. But among all the little Italian villages of mud-and-wicker huts one would have searched in vain for a person who could read or write, or design a temple, or build a marble palace. As compared with Egypt, Mesopotamia, or Greece, Italy was a backward land, beyond the western confines of civilization.

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

AN ANCIENT EGYPTIAN GAME

This game, found in an Egyptian tomb of about 1800 B.C., is made of ivory and ebony veneer and the playing pieces are of ivory. More than a thousand years before Rome entered upon her career of conquest, the Egyptians were sufficiently cultured to make and use this sort of thing. When it was made, the Romans were illiterate farmers and herdsmen.

The Etruscans. — Just as the Italians were beginning to discard bronze for iron (the knowledge of which had doubtless been learned indirectly from Western Asia), a series of new invasions occurred. This time the intruders were seafaring folk from the East. Among them were the Etruscans (ē-trŭs′kănz), whose origin has long been a puzzle. Evidence is heaping up in favor of the theory that the Etruscans were piratical sea-rovers from Asia



Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

A Græco-Etruscan Chariot

This chariot, the so-called Biga chariot, is of Græco-Etruscan manufacture and dates probably from the sixth century, B.C.

Minor and that they settled in central Italy between 1000 and 800 B.C. In the region now called Tuscany, but anciently known as Etruria, the Etruscans built a dozen or so walled cities, which were united in a league strong enough to conquer most of Italy (as far north as the Alps, as far east as the Adriatic, and at one time as far south as Naples).

The Etruscans are important in history not for their own sake, but because they linked Italy with the older civilizations of the

East. They brought to Italy the culture of Western Asia. Moreover, from very early times they did a thriving business with Greek traders, who were eager to obtain Etruscan iron and copper in exchange for Greek pottery and cloth. From the Greeks the Etruscans borrowed the alphabet, Greek armor and methods of fighting, Greek styles of painting and sculpture. How the Etruscans passed on to Rome, not only these things but also the Babylonian secret of building the masonry arch, and many another feature of the older civilizations, will soon be made clear.



GRÆCO-ETRUSCAN ART

Decoration of a panel on the chariot shown on the preceding page.

Greek Colonies. — The Etruscans were followed by Greek colonists, who settled farther south. The Greek colony of Cumæ (kū′mē) was founded on the western coast of the peninsula at least as early as 800 B.C. During the eighth and seventh centuries Greek colonies were planted thickly along the coasts of southern Italy (which came to be known as "Great Greece" — Magna Græcia, the Romans called it). In eastern Sicily, also, there were Greek colonies, among which the city of Syracuse became most famous.[1] Western Sicily, on the other hand, was colonized by Phœnicians from Syria and Carthage. The Greek colonies, however, were more numerous and more influential. Eastern Sicily

[1] See pp. 140, 179–181, 207–208.

and southern Italy were really part of the Greek world. Their story has been told, as it should be, in connection with the history of Athens, Sparta, Thebes, and Miletus.[1] Up to about the year 300 B.C. they seemed far more important and more promising than Rome. Yet Rome was to conquer them all, and their culture was to captivate Rome.

The City of Rome

Early History. — According to ancient Roman legends, the city was founded in the year 753 B.C. by Romulus and Remus, twin brothers who had been nursed by a she-wolf. Modern historians do not regard these legends as true, nor can they accept many of the details of Rome's early history as given by ancient writers. It seems clear, however, that for a time Rome was a petty city-state, ruled by kings and engaging in frequent wars with her neighbors, and that the Tarquins, the last dynasty of kings, were overthrown about the end of the sixth century B.C. (the traditional date is 509 B.C.). Rome then became a republic.

A City of Farmers. — As we see it first in the dim dawn of its history, in the sixth century B.C., the Italian city on the Tiber was far less civilized as well as considerably smaller and younger than the Greek cities on the Ægean. At that time Phidias was adorning the Parthenon of Athens with immortal masterpieces of gleaming marble and gold, and Athenian audiences were listening to the classic dramas of Æschylus and Sophocles, and Socrates was engaging in philosophical discussions that have echoed through all the centuries. Fifth-century Rome, however, had no Phidias, no Æschylus, no Socrates. Art and literature were little appreciated, as yet, by the farmers and mechanics who built their adobe huts on the "seven hills"[2] of Rome. We have no proof that the Romans could even write much, before 600 B.C. They were just beginning, thanks to Etruscan influence, to build temples for their gods as the Etruscans did; but they used coarse brownish or grayish stone (*tufa*) rather than marble or granite, and they had to hire Etruscan

[1] See pp. 135–136, 140, 141, 179–181, 201–202, 207–208.

[2] Only six hills were then embraced in the city walls. The seventh, the Aventine, was included in the fourth century B.C.

and Greek artists to embellish such edifices with gilt-bronze sculptures and painted terra-cotta figures. Roman blacksmiths could make armor and weapons and agricultural tools. Probably there were mechanics to satisfy other simple wants. A few traders were beginning to deal in Etruscan and other imported luxuries. The majority of Rome's citizens, however, were farmers whose grainfields and pastures lay outside the strong city walls. The very fact that they had only lumps of copper to serve as money, and had no need of a silver coinage, is convincing evidence that foreign trade and business were still in a very elementary stage.

An Etruscan Painting

Advantageous Location of Rome. — Geographical factors favored this rising town. Situated near the mouth of the Tiber, far enough inland to be secure against sea-raiders yet not too far upstream to be reached by seagoing ships, Rome was well placed to become the port and market-center of the Tiber Valley. It was also on a north-and-south trade route, where an island in the Tiber and a wooden bridge made the crossing of the river easy. Moreover, Rome was far enough north to be free of Greek domination, and yet not far enough to be subject to the full force of the repeated barbarian invasions of the Po Valley. Furthermore, lying in the heart of the fertile plain of Latium, Rome had to defend

herself and the plain against the raids of less civilized mountain tribes. Such raids schooled Rome in the art of war. Finally, Rome was on the southern border of Etruria.

Etruscan Influence. — Her proximity to Etruria greatly affected Rome. Probably the Tarquin dynasty of kings in Rome, during the sixth century B.C., was Etruscan. At any rate, Rome came under strong Etruscan influence at that time. The Etruscans taught Rome to build temples in the Etruscan style and to make

DECORATION ON AN ETRUSCAN TOMB

images of their gods. From the Etruscans Rome borrowed the superstitious practice of attempting to divine the future by watching the peculiar actions of birds or inspecting the livers of animals. This was done before any important decision was made by the government. Through the Etruscans, mainly, the Romans learned to write, using a modified form of the Greek alphabet, which the Etruscans had learned from Cumæ. Etruscan influence probably fostered the development of aristocracy, for Etruria

was a land of great landlords, wealthy merchants, serfs, and slaves, rather than of small farmers. Most important of all, the Etruscans introduced the Greek phalanx.

The Phalanx. — Previously the Romans had fought, like other Italian tribesmen, without order or discipline. The nobles, on horseback or in chariots, engaged in individual encounters, while the light-armed commoners counted for little. The Etruscans, however, had encountered the heavy-armed phalanxes of the Greek colonies in Italy, and had imitated them by equipping the infantry with Greek armor, helmet, lance, and shield, and forming the troops into a solid body of several thousand men. From the Etruscans, the Romans in turn borrowed this method of fighting. Now the Roman farmers were divided into classes, as the Athenians had been, and commanded to buy armor, heavy or light according to their wealth, and drilled to fight in a compact phalanx, presenting a bristling row of spears and shields against the foe. The spearmen were drawn up, 500 men in a row, and six ranks deep, with archers and cavalry on the sides. This was the phalanx. With it Rome began her career of conquest.

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

ITALIAN ARMOR OF THE SEVENTH CENTURY, B.C.

Roman Religion. — The most vital religious practices of the early Romans centered in the home and the farm. Every dwell-

ing had its homely gods — its *Lares* (ancestral spirits of farm and home) and *Penates* (spirits of the storeroom). *Vesta* was the spirit of the fire on the hearth. *Janus*, two-faced god of beginnings and endings, guarded the doorway. There were spirits of the threshold and the door hinges, of seed and crops, of pasture, of rivers and springs, as well as evil spirits of malaria and blight. These were the everyday gods of home-loving farmers. In a sense, the home was the most important temple, for there the worship of Vesta and of the Lares and Penates was celebrated.

State Religion. — The state, as well as the family, had its gods. Six Vestal Virgins tended the sacred fire of Vesta. Janus had his temple, the doors of which were open in time of war, and closed in time of peace. Jupiter, the sky-god, whom the Romans later identified with the Greek Zeus, was the special protector of Rome, as Athena was of Athens. Juno, supreme goddess, was patroness of women. Mars, originally an agricultural god, became god of war, like the Greek Ares. The buxom Ceres, goddess of crops, was particularly popular with the masses of Roman farmers.

Patricians and Plebs in the Roman Republic

The Patricians and Their Privileges. — In the Roman city-state, as in most ancient states, the citizens were not equal in rights but were divided into an upper class and a lower class.

The upper class consisted of aristocrats or nobles enjoying greater privileges and more wealth than the common people. In Rome these privileged aristocrats were called "patricians" (pȧ-trĭsh′ănz). Membership in the patrician class was hereditary; the son of a patrician was a patrician by right of birth. The special privileges enjoyed by patricians may be summarized as follows: (1) *Political.* Only patricians could sit in the Senate or be elected to the higher offices in the government. (2) *Economic.* The patricians owned the largest farms and were therefore the wealthiest men in the community. On their farms they had numbers of tenants known as "clients," from whom they received certain payments or dues. (3) *Social.* The patricians were considered to be socially superior to the common people. They were intensely proud of their ancestry and their high social

position. (4) *Religious.* Only patricians could serve as priests in the worship of the gods of the state religion. Since religion was closely bound up with politics, this religious privilege was of real importance. (5) *Legal.* The laws of Rome were at first unwritten customs, interpreted by the patricians for their own benefit. Instead of protecting the rights of all, the laws protected the special privileges of the patricians.

The Plebs and Their Grievances. — The common people were termed the "plebs" (plĕbz). The plebeians (plē-bē′yăns) or members of this lower class were mostly workingmen, hired men, and poor farmers. They were freemen and citizens, but their rights were few and their grievances bitter. Their chief complaints were: (1) That they did not have enough of a voice in the government. (2) That debts and mortgages ought to be cancelled. Poor men often borrowed money at very high rates of interest and got hopelessly into debt; frequently they mortgaged their farms and lost them to the lender; and debtors were sometimes compelled to become the slaves of the men who had lent them money. (3) That the patricians ought not to be allowed to send large herds of cattle and flocks of sheep to graze on the public pastures so that the poor man found it hard to pasture his few cows there. (4) That the public lands ought to be taken away from patricians, who were illegally treating such lands as their own property, and divided up into small farms for the poor. These economic grievances made the plebs all the more anxious to secure a share in the government.

Roman Government in the 5th Century B.C. — During the first century of its existence, the government of the Roman Republic was largely a government by the patricians and for the patricians.

The Consuls. — The highest officials or magistrates were the two consuls, elected for one year by the Assembly. Only patricians could be elected. The consuls really had practically the same powers that the king had exercised before the establishment of the republic. (1) First of all, they were the commanders of the army, and when in the field could put any soldier to death for disobedience. (2) They had the legislative power to propose new laws for the Assembly's approval; and they could issue edicts

or proclamations which in modern times would be considered as having the same purpose as laws. (3) They had the judicial power to act as judges in certain kinds of law suits. (4) They had the administrative power to carry out and enforce the laws, and to inflict penalties on any citizen for violating a law. However, before the extreme penalty of death could be inflicted within the city walls, the citizen might appeal to the Assembly. In token of their supreme authority — which the Romans called "imperium" (ĭm-pē′rĭ-ŭm) — the consuls were followed by attendants known as "lictors" carrying "fasces," which were bundles of rods with an axe in the middle of each bundle. This custom was borrowed from the Etruscans, as well as the custom of providing for the consul a special chair decorated with ivory and of allowing him to wear a border of the royal purple on his gown ("toga").

Other Officials. — The right of either consul to veto the other's decisions was a desirable check on tyranny in normal times; but whenever the city was in great peril the consuls were temporarily replaced by a "dictator," who was given supreme power in order to defeat the enemy or end the danger.

About the middle of the fifth century, it became necessary to increase the number of officials. Two "quæstors" (kwĕs′torz), and later four, were elected to act as treasurers and keepers of the records. "Censors" were elected to take the census of citizens, assess the taxes, appoint the citizens to the proper classes in the army, and award contracts for public works. "Ædiles" (ē′dīlz) were elected to supervise the markets, public works, streets, and water supply. In the following century, two "prætors" (prē′torz) were elected to assist the consuls, chiefly by acting as judges for lawsuits, and by announcing each year what laws would be applied. All these officials were elected by the Assembly, and all except the ædiles had to be patricians. To complete this list we must add the "tribunes," whose functions will be described in a later paragraph.

The Senate. — Chiefly because it consisted of the patricians — the richest and most influential men in Rome — the Senate was a very powerful body. All laws and all candidates for the chief government offices had to have the Senate's approval. The Sen-

ate decided what foreign policies should be followed, in Rome's dealings with other countries. It regulated taxation and expenditures. And in many other ways, which it would take too long to describe, the Senate exercised its powerful control over legislation, administration, and government business in general.

The Assembly. — Historians have found it difficult to describe the Assembly accurately, because it had three different names and methods of voting. (1) In its oldest form it was called the "Assembly of Curias" (Comitia Curiata). This was really a meeting of landowners, who were divided into thirty groups called "curias" (kū′rĭ-*ȧz*). Each curia had one vote. (2) More frequently the people met as an "Assembly of Companies" (Comitia Centuriata). This was practically a meeting of the army, which included all able-bodied citizens and was organized in units called companies or "centuries"; probably each "century" originally comprised a hundred men, but in practice the number was often less. There were about 200 companies in the fifth century. As the cavalry and heavy-infantry companies, consisting of rich and well-to-do men, had the largest number of votes, the poorer people had little voice. (3) A more democratic form of the Assembly was established in the fifth century — the "Assembly of Tribes" (Comitia Tributa). This was primarily a gathering of the common people or plebeians, and the voting was by "tribes" rather than by curias or by companies. A "tribe" at this time was one of the twenty or so districts into which Rome was divided for the purpose of regulating taxes and recruiting for the army.

In all three of its forms, the Assembly had certain peculiarities which are worth noting. First, it could not propose new laws, or offer amendments, but could only vote yes or no on proposals made by officials with the approval of the Senate. Second, the individual members did not have the right to debate freely on measures brought before them. Third, the voting was always by groups — either curias, or companies, or tribes.

Some historians treat the Assembly of Curias, the Assembly of Companies, and the Assembly of Tribes as three separate Assemblies, but find it impossible to draw a clear and accurate dividing

line between the functions and powers of the three. We prefer to regard them simply as different forms of the Assembly, and to say simply that the Assembly, in one form or another, had four important rights: (1) to vote on the adoption of new laws; (2) to elect the consuls and other officials of the government; (3) to vote on the declaration of war and on treaties of peace; and (4) to act as a court of appeal for citizens upon whom the death penalty had been pronounced by a consul. Yet the Roman Assembly had much less power than the Athenian Assembly had in this same fifth century B.C. To a considerable extent it simply approved laws already drawn up by the officials, treaties already made, and candidates already selected by the patrician leaders.

Law: the Twelve Tables. — How the first Roman code of laws was prepared, about 449 B.C., is not definitely known. The Romans in later ages, however, believed that a committee was sent to Athens to study Solon's laws, and that the actual work of compiling the Roman code was done by two committees of ten men ("decemviri"), sitting in two successive years, and that the laws were engraved on twelve tablets of bronze. The laws defined crimes and penalties, and dealt with various matters of property rights, personal rights, and legal procedure. The provision that a man must pay twice as much for breaking the bone of a freeman as for doing the same injury to a slave throws some light on early Roman ideas of justice. And the fairly elaborate laws regarding the confiscation of a debtor's property, allowing the plaintiff creditor to shackle the unhappy debtor with "fetters of at least fifteen pounds' weight," afford some inkling of the way in which the laws favored the rich rather than the poor.

Increase of Plebeian Rights. — Under a government in which, as the preceding pages explain, most of the power was in the hands of patrician consuls and of the patrician Senate, the plebeians seem to have been in a state of chronic discontent and rebellion. Repeatedly the plebs threatened to secede and set up a new government of their own. According to Roman traditions it was in this way that the first great plebeian victory was won in the year 466 B.C. (the date 494 B.C. given in older textbooks is probably erroneous).

(1) *The Tribunes.* — What the plebeians gained in the year 466 B.C. was the right to elect four special plebeian officials, the "tribunes," to defend plebeian rights. (*a*) At first the one great function of the tribunes was to stop a consul or any other official from inflicting any unjust penalty on a citizen. (*b*) Later the tribunes went a step farther, and assumed the right to impeach any official, before the Assembly of Tribes, for wrong conduct in office. (*c*) In time, also, the tribunes asserted the right to sit on a bench at the door of the Senate and stop the discussion of any measure by simply shouting "veto," which means "I forbid." Still later, the tribunes gained the right to sit in the Senate, to speak in it, and to call it together. (*d*) Finally, the tribunes gradually acquired important legislative authority, and in the third century B.C. most legislation was proposed by the tribunes and adopted by the Assembly of Tribes.

(2) *Assembly of Tribes.* — A second step toward democracy, taken at about the same time as the establishment of the tribunes, was the creation of the Assembly of Tribes as a third form, and a more democratic form, of the Assembly. As the Assembly has been described, we need only mention this point here.

(3) *Admission of Plebeians to High Offices.* — From the beginning, the tribunes and ædiles were plebeians; but only gradually did the plebeians gain the right to be elected to other government offices. Near the close of the fifth century, the quæstorship was thrown open to plebeians. In the fourth century B.C., the first plebeian consul was elected, and the custom was established that one of the two consuls must be a plebeian. During the fourth century, also, plebeians were elected for the first time to the offices of dictator, prætor, and censor; and at the very end of the century the state priesthood was opened to them.

(4) *Plebeians in the Senate.* — As the high government officials were given life membership in the Senate, after serving their term of office, the fact that plebeians could hold the chief offices meant that plebeian ex-officials, year by year, were added to the Senate. Thus the Senate ceased to be exclusively patrician, and the distinction between patrician and plebeian gradually became less important than the distinction between senators and non-senators.

(5) *Increase of the Assembly's Power.* — Roman historians tell us that in the third century B.C., the plebs, still discontented, again threatened to secede from the city and marched out to a nearby hill. To deal with the crisis, Hortensius was appointed dictator. He conciliated the plebs by passing a law — the Hortensian Law of 287 B.C. — that henceforth the Assembly of Tribes should have the right to pass laws binding upon the whole people, and that the Senate's approval of such laws must be given as a matter of course. By giving the Assembly genuine legislative power, this law made the Roman government much more nearly democratic than ever before.

Political Democracy and Economic Problems. — The reforms mentioned above transformed the exclusive patrician aristocracy of Rome into a moderately democratic republic and to a large extent broke down the hereditary distinction between patricians and plebs. Not a few plebeians became wealthy, held the highest positions in the government, entered the Senate, and married into patrician families.

From the economic point of view, however, there still remained a wide gulf between the wealthy upper classes (now including some plebeians) and the mass of poorer farmers, tenants, and city workingmen. All through the fifth, the fourth, and the third century, and indeed in later centuries, the poor continued to demand (*a*) cancellation or reduction of debts and mortgages, and (*b*) land reform. A politician could easily make himself popular with the masses by advocating these two demands. A Roman historian informs us that ten years of exceptionally bitter political strife in the fourth century led to the enactment of a series of reforms known as the Licinian (lī-sĭn′ĭ-ăn) Laws of 367 B.C., one of which provided that debts were to be reduced by deducting the amount of interest paid on them. Another of these laws forbade any one person to use more than 500 "jugera" (about 333 acres) of the public land, or to keep more than 100 head of cattle and 500 sheep on the public pastures. The purpose of this law was to limit the amount of public land used by the rich, so that there would be enough to supply pasture for the cattle and sheep of small farmers and to provide small farms

for poor men who had no land. These reforms, however, were never carried out faithfully, and the land and debt problems remained to trouble Rome, as we shall see in Chapter X.

Unification of Italy by Rome

While these political changes were occurring, Rome was fighting a series of almost incessant wars, from about 350 to 265 B.C., by which all Italy was brought under Roman domination. For the astonishing prowess revealed by what had hitherto been a very inconspicuous little city-state, one is tempted to seek some reason. The most natural explanation is offered by the character of the Roman military organization.

Military Organization. — The heavy-armed phalanx with which the Romans began their career of aggression proved to be unwieldy for fighting in hilly country. The phalanx could be kept in good order only on a plain. Accordingly, the phalanx was broken up into smaller units known as legions. Usually the army consisted of four legions supplied by Rome herself and four supplied by her allies; but in case of need, especially in later times, the number of legions in the army was increased to sixteen or even more. The Roman legion was a body of four or five thousand infantrymen, wearing helmet, shield, and armor, and carrying heavy iron-pointed javelins to hurl at the enemy. For fighting at close quarters each man also carried a short sword. The legion was divided into companies and drilled so perfectly that it could spread out in open order when necessary, leaving spaces between the companies, or close in to form a solid, impenetrable line. Usually the less experienced young men were put in front for the preliminary attack, while the veterans formed a reserve for decisive encounters. As Rome was almost continually at war, the soldiers received regular pay, and it became a rule that every citizen must serve in sixteen campaigns — that is, for sixteen summers, the campaigns being ordinarily short affairs of a single summer.

Morale of Soldiers. — The Roman soldiers were of splendid quality. As hard-working farmers who alternated between the grainfield and the battlefield, they were men of exceptional strength and endurance. Their discipline was unequalled. No enemy

commander could compel his troops, as the Roman consuls did, to build an elaborate fortified camp each night, no matter how long the march or how exhausting the battle through which they had passed during the day. In no other army did the soldiers so well combine the well-drilled ability to maneuver in mass formation with the ability to fight in small groups or as individuals. Oriental armies and even Greek phalanxes often went to pieces the moment their line was broken. Roman discipline was not wholly due to the fact that the consuls could punish disobedience with instant death. The Romans felt defeat as a disgrace, and many of them considered dishonor worse than death. Moreover, in the early wars, when Roman military traditions were being developed, the soldiers knew that they were fighting, not to gratify some tyrant's ambition, but to defend their own farms and families or to win booty and land. It would be a mistake to underrate this last factor, for it was the mainspring of most ancient warfare. Victory meant more land for the farmer-soldiers who fought in Rome's legions.

Rome's Early Enemies. — Another reason for Rome's militarism was the fact that for several centuries the city was under the necessity of being ever ready for battle. On the north was the Etruscan League of twelve strong cities, any one of which might have been considered a fair match for the town on the Tiber. To the east, on the mountains that could so easily be seen on clear days, were the hardy Sabine (Safine) tribes, the chief group of which was known as the Samnite nation. There was danger, too, from envious sister-cities in the Latin plain. And, finally, there were occasional dreaded invasions by wandering hordes of barbarians from the north. Such constant perils kept the Roman military spirit alive and vigilant.

Conquest of Veii. — That was the condition during the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. Rome made little headway until the overshadowing power of her northern neighbor, Etruria, had begun to crumble. The Etruscan League had begun to weaken in the sixth century, because of the increasing love of luxury and dislike of military life on the part of the Etruscan aristocrats, and because various Italian tribes were pressing hard on the frontiers. Doubtless the successful revolt of Rome from the

Tarquin dynasty in 509 B.C. was merely one incident in this process, for Rome alone was then too small and too weak to defy Etruria. In the next century, the fifth, the Etruscan fleet was disastrously defeated by the great Greek-Sicilian state of Syracuse. At the same time, a fresh barbarian invasion entered northern



EARLY ROME

Etruria. Invading tribes of tall and fair-haired Gauls (who also occupied France), crossed the Alps into the north Italian plain and ousted the Etruscans from the fertile northern provinces. It was while Etruria was standing at bay against the Gauls on the north that the Romans attacked from the south and besieged Veii

(vē′yī), the southernmost of Etruscan cities. The Etruscan League was too busy with the Gauls to aid Veii. Veii was taken by a Roman dictator, in the year 396 B.C., while the Gauls were capturing another Etruscan town in the north.[1]

Division of Conquered Land. — The conquest of Etruscan Veii doubled Rome's area. Veii was destroyed, its people sold into slavery, and its land distributed to Romans. The land allotments increased the number of Roman landholders, and thus increased the heavy infantry, which consisted exclusively of landowners. Perhaps the increase of the political rights of the plebs in Rome may be regarded as another indirect result, for the land allotments must have increased the number and wealth, and therefore the influence, of plebeian proprietors.

Conquest of Latium. — Rome was now by far the largest city-state on the plain of Latium. And she became still larger, a few years later, by defeating two Italic tribes (the Æqui and Volsci) on the borders of Latium. The other Latin cities were envious and apprehensive as they watched Rome's growth. For more than a century they had been allies of Rome in a loose federation known as the Latin League (486–336 B.C.). But about 338 B.C. war broke out between Rome and the other League members, and after two years of battles and sieges Rome found herself undisputed mistress of the plain. Some of her former allies she annexed outright; only two were allowed to remain as partly independent "Latin allies." Several younger cities which had been founded by colonists, partly from Rome and partly from other Latin cities, were raised to the same rank as allies.

Militarism in Full Swing. — From this time forward, for three generations, the doors of the temple of Janus were more often open than closed. Each spring the Roman legions marched out, to return in the fall battle-scarred and footsore but laden with loot. Rome was conquering Italy. The process was surprisingly rapid, partly because Rome now had a large army of well-tried veterans and well-trained youths; partly because each Roman

[1] The Gauls later captured Rome, in the year 387 B.C., but were either expelled, according to Roman legends, or were paid a thousand pounds of gold to give up the city.

ITALY, ABOUT 265 B.C.

general was spurred on by hope of returning victorious to ride through the city in triumphal procession with captives and booty in his train; partly because Rome reinforced her own army by drawing contingents of troops from her Latin allies and from the peoples she conquered; and partly because the plebs at Rome were becoming even more eager than the patricians, if that were possible, for land and spoils of war.

Samnite Wars. — The most stubborn enemy was the group of Samnite tribes, the hardy people of the hills, who had spread along the ridge of the Apennines and were beginning to descend upon the tempting coastal plains.

In the richest of these plains — Campania — the cities of Capua and Naples, feeling themselves menaced by the Samnites, turned to Rome for protection. With them Rome made alliances. This step meant war with the Samnites. From 325 to 290 B.C. the struggle with the Samnites continued. The Samnite Wars were not easily won. Once a Roman army of forty thousand men, so the story goes, was led by two rash consuls into a mountain pass, where it was trapped and captured by the Samnites and compelled not only to give up its arms but to suffer the bitter humiliation of passing under the "yoke" (a spear supported in horizontal position) while the enemy looked on and jeered. More than once defeat stared Rome in the face, but she never admitted failure. In the end, the Samnites and their allies (Sabines and Picentes) were conquered and added to the list of Rome's "allies."

Conquest of Etruria. — Now Rome was free to deal with the Etruscans. All the cities of Etruria were conquered and converted into "allies," before 280 B.C. About the same time, the tribe of Gauls that occupied the land just south of the Rubicon River on the eastern coast was driven back across the Rubicon and their land was appropriated by Rome. On the north Rome's power now extended to the Rubicon and Arnus rivers (see map) but did not yet include the Po Valley.

Magna Græcia. — The southern part of the Italian Peninsula was known as Magna Græcia (Great Greece) and was controlled in large part by highly civilized Greek cities such as Tarentum, Thurii, Heraclea, Elea, Rhegium, and Locri. Their citizens,

however, were no longer warlike. Like other Greek cities in this age, they had learned to hire foreigners to fight for them. Moreover, mutual rivalry made it impossible for them to combine against the rising Roman power. Indeed, one of these Greek cities (Thurii) invited Rome to protect it against another (Tarentum). And when Rome declared war on Tarentum (281 B.C.), Tarentum called to its aid not only neighboring Italian tribes, but also Pyrrhus (pĭr′ŭs), the ambitious king of the Greek state of Epirus (ē-pī′rŭs), across the Ionian Sea.

Pyrrhus. — Eager to imitate Alexander the Great, Pyrrhus crossed the sea to Italy with a phalanx of 20,000 men, besides cavalry and war elephants. For the first time, the Roman legions encountered a first-class army organized on the plan that had recently enabled Alexander to conquer the Eastern world. Dismayed by the elephants and outgeneralled by Pyrrhus, the legions tasted defeat, and Pyrrhus marched triumphantly from southern Italy almost to the outskirts of Rome. Again he defeated the legions. But instead of making peace, Rome stubbornly continued the war, and allied herself with Carthage, the greatest sea-power of the western Mediterranean. Pyrrhus, disappointed at the result of his victories (and they had been costly victories), now crossed over from Italy to Sicily, hoping to make himself master of the island. No sooner had he won a few victories there, than the Sicilian Greeks who had invited him to come, deserted him. With depleted forces he returned to Italy. His fleet had been sunk by the Carthaginians. Soon his army was defeated in battle with the Romans. Sadly discouraged, he took the remnants of his phalanx back to Greece, leaving Tarentum to her fate. Tarentum and the other Greek cities of southern Italy were unable to continue the war much longer. Soon they were forced into submission as "allies," subordinates, of Rome. By 270 B.C. all southern Italy was under Roman domination. An interesting sequel of the wars with Pyrrhus was that the booty captured by the Romans was used in part to build an aqueduct 37 miles long, which would bring pure water to Rome from the mountains.

Italian Allies. — In its treatment of conquered peoples the Roman Senate was singularly shrewd and successful. Van-

quished foes were usually allowed to keep most of their land, their own municipal or tribal government, their own institutions and laws. They were "allied" rather than annexed to Rome. The one thing on which Rome insisted was that instead of fighting on their own account, henceforth they must follow her lead in war and peace, sending their troops to serve in her wars under command of her generals. The Greek cities were excused from this duty, but they were required to provide warships instead of troops. Altogether there must have been about 150 tribes and cities — Greek, Etruscan, Italic, and others — in this class of "allies." Rome called them, rather inappropriately, her "Italian allies."

Latin Allies and Colonies. — On a somewhat different footing were the "Latin allies" and "colonies." These included the two old Latin cities that had been spared from annexation in 336 B.C.; and seven colonies that had been founded before that date by Roman and Latin settlers; and a score or more of new colonies established between 336 and 265 B.C. Each time an enemy state was conquered, Rome took a portion of its farm lands,[1] and, while part of this new land was held as Roman public property to be used by Roman citizens, the other part was often assigned to a colony. A colony was a group of three thousand citizens, more or less, to each of whom a small farm was allotted. Such colonies not only provided the landless with farms, and not only relieved the surplus population of Rome, but also served as military garrisons whose loyalty was guaranteed by the desire of the settlers to keep their farms.

Rights of Cities. — Another ingenious policy was that of promoting cities as a reward of loyalty. Some of the old Latin cities that had been annexed to Rome were given the grade of "cities without suffrage." Their inhabitants had the private rights of Roman citizens and enjoyed (or at least possessed) the right of serving in the Roman legions, but could not vote or hold office in Rome. For good behavior such cities might be raised to the

[1] Professor Tenney Frank has estimated that before the Second Punic War (218 B.C.), Rome took only about three per cent of the conquered land, on the average. Other writers have asserted that she took as much as thirty per cent. In a few cases she took all the land of an enemy.

rank of municipalities with full Roman citizenship, as well as with the right of municipal home rule. This device was applied not only to the old Latin cities, but to a number of other conquered communities and colonies. It was one of the means by which the

RUINS OF THE FORUM AND THE TEMPLE OF JUPITER AT POMPEII

Pompeii and most other Italian towns became "little Romes" in architecture, as well as in language, thanks to the unification of Italy under the leadership of Rome.

diverse races of Italy were gradually welded into one people, loyal to Rome.

Unity and Roads. — Some of the other unifying devices should also be noted. Conquered communities were often given the rights of intermarriage and trade with Roman citizens. In the year 269 B.C., just as her conquest of the peninsula was about completed, Rome began to mint a silver coin (the *denarius*) in place of the old heavy bronze money. The denarius helped to unify the business life of Italy.

Above all Rome built good roads. Prosaic they may seem, but roads are arteries of civilization. The network of military roads which Rome built, radiating north and south and east from the city, made it true even then that "all roads lead to Rome." As a matter of fact, the roads were originally intended chiefly to lead *from* Rome. They were meant to make easier the outward march of the legions in time of war, and to keep the metropolis in touch with her military colonies. Yet they did much more than that. They promoted trade; they carried the Roman denarius back and forth throughout Italy; they helped to spread the Latin tongue. Some hint of what they brought to Rome may be given, perhaps, by the statement that Rome's first dramatist was a captive brought to Rome from Tarentum by way of the famous Appian Road or *Via Appia* — the road to the south, built by Appius Claudius in the period of the Samnite Wars.

Growth of Rome. — Here the first chapter of Roman history may well be ended. The little town of farmers' huts on the "seven hills," obscure and illiterate before the sixth century B.C., an infant in comparison with the venerable cities of the Nile and the Tigris-Euphrates, a barbarian upstart as compared with Athens and Syracuse, had learned much from the East through Etruria and Cumæ, and was now about to learn more. Originally little more than a collection of adobe villages, it had become a large city, with perhaps two or three hundred thousand inhabitants. Temples and palaces were beginning to spring up. Tenement houses were covering the lands between and around the hills.

Roman Triumphs. — The farmers who in former times had so often been called from their ploughing to snatch armor and sword from the wall and fight for their homes, were now long dead; their grandsons were now veteran legionaries, ready to encounter any enemy, sure of the victory that would result eventually in a triumphal procession. In such a procession the general rode in a chariot, wearing a purple toga and carrying a laurel branch as a symbol of victory. He was attended by white oxen and by captives marching to their death. He was followed by the soldiers, singing and shouting as they marched along the stone-paved Sacred Road (*Via Sacra*) through the Forum and up the Capitoline

Hill to the Temple of Jupiter. The greatest triumphs were still to be celebrated. Rome had conquered only Italy.

Rome's Opportunity. — Alexander's Empire, established when Rome was beginning her Samnite Wars, had fallen apart, and the fragments were there for Rome to fit into a still greater Empire. In the long perspective of history, Rome's conquest of Italy was only the first step toward her goal. Rome's historic task was to bring southern Europe, northern Africa, and western Asia together in a world Empire, in which the culture of the Tigris, of the Nile, and of the Ægean would be blended with the practical institutions of Italy and passed on to the future nations of Europe.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. In order to compare the stages of culture through which Italy passed with similar stages in the history of the Near Eastern peoples, make a concise time-chart for yourself: in one column set down with their dates the landmarks of Italian history, such as the founding of the Roman Republic, the Licinian Laws, the Hortensian Law, Roman conquest of Latium, the Samnite Wars, Roman conquest of southern Italy; and in another column set down for comparison the dates of the Old Kingdom and the Empire in Egypt, the Code of Hammurabi, the empire of Assyria, the chief Persian conquests, Dorian invasions, the transformation of Athens into a republic, the reforms of Solon, the reforms of Cleisthenes, the founding of the Delian Confederacy, the Age of Pericles, the Peloponnesian War, and the establishment of Alexander's Empire. Can you explain why Italy's early development lagged behind that of Near Eastern lands?

2. What influence did Etruria have upon the early development of Rome?

3. What were the chief Greek colonies in Italy and Sicily? (Refer to Chapter V.)

4. How was Rome's development facilitated by her geographic situation?

5. Compare the government of Rome in the fifth century B.C. with that of Athens in the preceding century.

6. What were the chief grievances of the plebeians? Summarize the steps by which the rights of the plebeians were enlarged, from 509 to 287 B.C.

7. Make a list, with dates, of the wars of conquest by which Rome established her power over the Italian Peninsula.



EXPANSION OF THE ROMAN

REPUBLIC, TO 44 B.C.

8. How did the colonies founded by Rome differ from the colonies founded by Miletus, Corinth, and other Greek cities, as described in Chapter V?

SPECIAL TOPICS

Prehistoric Italy. MYRES, *Dawn of History*, 217–238; BOAK, *History of Rome*, 7–12; FRANK, *History of Rome*, 1–7.

The Etruscans. BOAK, *History of Rome*, 15–19; CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY, IV, 411–432.

Rome under the Kings. GREENIDGE, *Roman Public Life*, ch. i; FRANK, *History of Rome*, 14–29; BOTSFORD, *Source-Book of Ancient History*, 334–346.

The Roman Senate. GREENIDGE, *Roman Public Life*, ch. vi.

Roman religion. SANDYS, *Companion to Latin Studies*, 149–161.

The Samnite Wars. FRANK, *Roman Imperialism*, ch. iv.

Roman dress and everyday life. SANDYS, *Companion to Latin Studies*, 190–200, 200–208.

Roman agriculture. FRANK, *Economic History of Rome*, 1–15; SANDYS, *Companion to Latin Studies*, 212–217; GRAS, *History of Agriculture*, 51–72.

The position of women in Rome. SANDYS, *Companion to Latin Studies*, 176–179, 184–190.

The unification of Italy. FRANK, *History of Rome*, 57–75.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THE TEACHER

G. W. BOTSFORD, *Syllabus of Roman History*. A. E. R. BOAK, *History of Rome to 565 A.D.* T. FRANK, *History of Rome*. SIR J. E. SANDYS (ed.), *Companion to Latin Studies*. R. A. L. FELL, *Etruria and Rome*. A. H. J. GREENIDGE, *Roman Public Life*. F. F. ABBOTT, *History and Description of Roman Political Institutions*. F. F. ABBOTT, *Roman Politics*. W. W. FOWLER, *Religious Experience of the Roman People*. W. R. HALLIDAY, *Lectures on the History of Roman Religion from Numa to Augustus*. J. T. SHOTWELL, *History of History*, chs. xviii–xix, xxi. CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY, IV, chs. xii–xiii. MRS. I. C. HALL, *Rome of the Kings*. PAUL-LOUIS, *Ancient Rome at Work*. M. ROSTOVTZEFF, *Ancient World*, II.

CONVENIENT SOURCE MATERIALS

G. W. and L. S. BOTSFORD, *Source-Book of Ancient History*. D. C. MUNRO, *Source Book of Roman History*. W. S. DAVIS, *Readings in Ancient History*, II. PLUTARCH, *Lives*.

CHAPTER IX

ROMAN CONQUESTS AND IMPERIALISM

Carthage and the Punic Wars

The steps by which the Roman farmer-soldiers arrived at world-empire were painful but persevering. A Cyrus of Persia or an Alexander of Macedon could leap into the center of the stage, but the Roman peasants plodded and stumbled. It is unlikely that they had any intention of creating a vast empire, at first. It took more than two centuries for the Roman legions to establish Roman rule over the lands surrounding the Mediterranean. Perhaps it was well for the human race that the legions did not march more swiftly. The centuries of wars of conquest gave the Romans time to absorb the culture of the countries the legions were conquering. Rome became more civilized as she expanded.

Carthage. — The first great foreign enemy Rome faced was Carthage. Founded before 800 B.C. by Phœnician colonists from Tyre, the "New Town" of Carthage, on the North African coast, became in time the chief maritime power of the western Mediterranean. When Rome was a fledgling city-state, Carthage was a wealthy Empire, controlling the whole North African coast from the Atlantic to the western border of Egypt, besides the southern part of Spain, the islands of Sardinia and Corsica, and the western part of Sicily. From Sicily to Gibraltar the Mediterranean was a Carthaginian lake. Passing through the Strait of Gibraltar, Carthaginian ships had cruised to the Madeira and Canary Islands, and along the western coasts of Europe, and far down the Atlantic coast of Africa. By the third century B.C., the "New Town," now more than five hundred years old, must have been a really large city. Foreigners were dazzled by its wealth. There were magnificent marble temples with pillars of gold and silver, gilded statues

designed by Greek artists, and sumptuous palaces owned by rich merchants. Outside the city, wealthy men had fine villas, surrounded with vineyards and olive orchards. The land was remarkably fertile, and was well cultivated by the native Libyans, upon whom the Carthaginians had imposed their rule. So well did the great Carthaginian landlords understand their business, that a book written by one of them (an adaptation of Greek treatises on agriculture) was in later ages translated into Latin and referred to by the Italians as an authority on scientific farming.

Carthaginian Commerce. — Besides villas and palaces, the visitor to Carthage would have seen workshops, factories, slums, and busy docks, where stevedores were constantly loading and unloading cargoes of copper and silver from Spain, of African ivory brought by caravan across the Sahara, of manufactures from Egypt and Syria, of the celebrated Carthaginian red woollen cloth, and of negro slaves. Carthage was primarily an industrial and commercial city.

Plutocracy. — Plutocracy means government by wealth. That is an exact description of Carthage. The wealth of the country was concentrated in the hands of a few rich and powerful families. These wealthy families controlled the Council and Senate which made the laws and decided the policies of the state. The two "Suffetes" or presidents, elected annually, may be compared with the Roman consuls, but had less power. There was a popular assembly of some sort, but we know little about it, save that it counted for nothing.

Carthaginian Sinews of War. — In another sense, too, wealth ruled at Carthage. The prosperous business men controlling the government had long ago discovered that gold and silver were the sinews of war. As long as they had money to pay for the building of ships and to hire barbarian troops, they could wage successful wars without the risks and inconveniences of serving in battle. To be sure, a few high-spirited young men formed a "Sacred Band" to fight in the army, and several families took pride in providing distinguished generals; but, as a rule, Carthaginian millionaires preferred to remain at home, in their purple robes and splendid palaces, paying the price of wars in gold rather than in their own

blood. In times of great peril, however, they did show their patriotism by burning children alive as sacrifices to the goddess Tanit and the god Baal-Moloch. With her hired armies of brave and warlike barbarians, her hundreds of war elephants, her big navy, and her wealth, Carthage was a power which Rome might well have feared to challenge.

Commercial Rivalry. — The modern reader may be tempted to look for commercial rivalry as the cause of the wars between Carthage and Rome. We know that in Rome's infancy she had made commercial treaties (509 and 348 B.C.) with Carthage, as many Mediterranean countries did, acknowledging Carthaginian control of the western Mediterranean. Roman ships could trade directly with Carthage, but not with Carthaginian colonies. Ships breaking this rule were seized, and their crews were cast overboard. We are told, too, that an arrogant Carthaginian admiral said, "The Romans cannot wash their hands in the sea without our consent." Roman rule meant the open door for commerce, whereas Carthage consistently closed the door of her colonies to foreign trade. This factor, however, should not be overemphasized. Rome had not yet engaged in overseas commerce on a large scale; Roman merchant ships must have been scarce at that time, and the overwhelming majority of members in Senate and Assembly must have been farmers indifferent to sea-power. As late as the year 279 B.C. there was not enough commercial rivalry to prevent Rome and Carthage from allying themselves against the Greek adventurer Pyrrhus. Rome at this time was more interested in conquering additional land than in commerce and shipping. For the real cause of conflict we must look elsewhere.

The Situation in Sicily. — Only a strait two miles wide separates the large island of Sicily from the toe of Italy. Sooner or later, the power that had conquered Italy would cross that narrow channel. In Sicily it would meet Carthage. The latter possessed the western half (or more) of the island, and had been waging frequent wars since the sixth century with the Greeks, chiefly with the powerful Greek city of Syracuse. It has been shrewdly suggested that the competition of the Sicilian Greeks with Car-

thage in the export of wine and olive oil was the economic motive for these endless wars between them.

Immediate Cause of War. — Roman intervention in Sicily was brought about by a band of Italian soldiers who had seized a town in Sicily and who appealed to Rome for protection. The Roman Senate realized that interfering in Sicily might cause war with Carthage and such a war would be a serious matter. A few Roman military leaders, however, eager for the glory and spoils of war, carried the matter to the Assembly of Companies, promising the people more land, cheaper grain, and a share in the plunder. This was the chief underlying cause of the war — the desire for land and plunder. There was also the important argument that if Carthage were not held in check she might next cross over to Italy. The war party won. The Assembly decided to send to Sicily a consul with the ordinary consular army of two legions.

First Punic War. — That was the beginning of the First Punic War (264–241 B.C.), the first phase of the deadly conflict between Rome and Carthage. The word Punic (pū′nĭc), by the way, reminds us that the Carthaginians were Phœnicians, for the Latin adjective *punicus* was derived from the word *Pœni* (Phœnicians). The men who began these wars died long before their close, and their grandchildren were old men before the feud between Rome and Carthage was brought to an end. The three Punic Wars covered a period of 119 years.

Roman Invasion of Sicily. — At first, fortune favored the Roman legions. Borrowing ships from Greek-Italian allies, the consul shipped his men across the strait of Messina by night, eluding the Carthaginian warships that patrolled the coast. The Carthaginian army was defeated. But as they proceeded to besiege the Punic strongholds in western Sicily, the Romans perceived that they could hope for no decisive success without a big navy.

Rome Becomes a Sea-Power. — Though the Roman farmer-soldiers knew little of ships, they built a fleet. A Carthaginian ship that had accidentally run aground served as a model for these amateur shipwrights. In an incredibly short time a forest disappeared, and in its place there was a fleet of a hundred and twenty

galleys, most of them having five tiers of oars and carrying a crew of three hundred oarsmen and a hundred and twenty soldiers. With their ships of unseasoned timber, and with some additional vessels provided by Greek-Italian allies, the Roman legions took to the water, doubtless feeling ill at ease if not actually seasick as they ventured out to sea.

Luck was with them, for they took a Punic fleet by surprise, when it was not massed in battle formation. If we may believe the ancient historian Polybius, ingenuity aided good luck. The Carthaginian ships, following the favorite naval tactics of the period, charged forward, oars lashing the water and metal beaks headed for the Roman ships. Naval battles were won, in those days, by ramming and smashing the enemy vessels. But the Romans, knowing that their oarsmen were not trained for such tactics, had put movable gangplanks on their ships. When an enemy attempted to ram, the gangplank was lowered and the great iron spike at its end crashed through the deck and held fast like an anchor. Swarming across the gangplank, Roman swordsmen made short work of the enemy crew. The battle ended with many Punic ships in Roman hands and the rest in flight. Rome had become amphibious. The naval battle of Mylæ (mī′lē), 260 B.C., was a landmark in history, because only by becoming a sea-power could Rome ever dominate the Mediterranean world.

Roman Defeat in Africa. — After Mylæ, the Romans could attack the Carthaginian possessions of Corsica and Sardinia. They could even send an army over to Africa. The cities there were without walls, for Carthage did not permit the fortification of the towns under her rule. For that reason, and perhaps because they hated their Carthaginian overlords, towns surrendered by scores to the advancing Roman legions. Carthage itself was in peril and would have made peace, had not the overconfident Roman consul, flushed with easy victories, insisted on terms that would have made Carthage a tributary of Rome. While negotiations were proceeding, a fresh supply of mercenary troops and war elephants arrived in Carthage. Under the command of a clever Greek soldier of fortune, these troops attacked the Roman army near Carthage. Dismayed and trampled down by the charging

elephants, the Roman legionaries were thrown into disorder and cut down in thousands. Only a sorry remnant escaped to carry the news back to Italy, and even this remnant was all but annihilated by a terrific storm at sea.

Victory at Sea. — With characteristic determination, the Romans built new fleets, and raised new legions. The war dragged on fifteen years more. In Sicily the Roman infantry was successful, on the whole, although the Carthaginian general Hamilcar (hămĭl′kär) continued a gallant resistance. On the seas, inexperienced Roman commanders lost one fleet after another, until seven hundred ships with over two hundred thousand men (so the old chronicles affirm) had been sent to the bottom. These numbers may be exaggerated, but it is certain that the Roman treasury was emptied, and toward the end of the war private contributions had to be collected to pay for the construction of a new fleet. This last effort was the one that decided the conflict. The new fleet defeated the enemy at sea and blockaded Hamilcar's army in Sicily. Carthage capitulated.

Terms of Peace. — Peace was made in the year 241 B.C. after twenty-four years of war. The courageous Hamilcar was allowed to depart from Sicily with all the honors of war. But Carthage paid the price of defeat — an indemnity of 3200 gold talents (nearly $4,000,000) and all of her possessions in western Sicily.

The cession of Sicily was of the greatest importance, as this was a rich wheat-growing country. In their Sicilian possessions the Carthaginians had practised the oriental custom of levying annual tribute. Rome simply took over the Carthaginian system. She collected five per cent of western Sicily's crops and five per cent of the exports. One careful historian has estimated that these imposts brought in the equivalent of a million dollars a year.[1]

Further Conquests. — After the war, Rome began to use her new navy for overseas conquests. The large islands of Sardinia and Corsica had rebelled against Carthage. When the latter proposed to reconquer them, Rome declared war, and compelled

[1] The tribute was levied only in western Sicily. In eastern Sicily several Greek cities became "allies" of Rome, and Syracuse remained independent as a "friend" until 212 B.C.

Carthage to purchase peace by paying an additional indemnity of 1200 talents and ceding the islands. Another step was taken a few years later, when Rome sent her fleet to punish the pirate queen of Illyria (on the eastern coast of the Adriatic) for allowing her subjects to seize Italian ships. Illyria was compelled to pay tribute, and several Greek cities along the Illyrian coast were taken under Roman protection as allies.

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

AN ITALIAN GREEK VASE OF THE FOURTH CENTURY, B.C.

A painted terra cotta vase from a Greek city in southern Italy, depicting scenes from Greek mythology. In other words, an example of the Greek culture with which the Romans came into contact when they conquered southern Italy.

Plight of Carthage. — After the First Punic War, Carthage seemed utterly broken. Her sea-power was gone, her treasury empty, her future mortgaged by the war indemnity. Worse still, when Hamilcar returned with his mercenary troops from Sicily, his opponents in the Carthaginian government refused to pay his soldiers their long overdue wages, and the result was a mutiny, which soon became a civil war. The non-Punic natives joined the mutineers against their Punic masters. In the desperate struggle both sides massacred captives with cruelty born of fear. Hamilcar, however, finally suppressed the revolt. And with surprising rapidity Carthaginian commerce revived.

Carthaginian Conquests in Spain. — The business men in power at Carthage would probably have been content with peace and profits. But Hamilcar the general was unwilling to lay down the sword. Shortly after he had suppressed the great mutiny we find him crossing over into Spain, with a small army, to recover and

enlarge the Carthaginian possessions in the southern part of the peninsula. Spanish silver mines supplied him with funds, and Spanish tribesmen provided him with excellent recruits for his army. When Hamilcar was killed, his son-in-law continued the work, and when the latter was murdered, young Hannibal, son of Hamilcar, took command. Many years later Hannibal told the story of how his father had taken him, when he was only a boy nine years old, into the temple of Baal-Moloch, to vow by the frightful god of Carthage that he would cherish eternal enmity toward Rome. That enmity explains his career.

Second Punic War. — The "Grace of Baal" (that is the meaning of Hannibal's name) was twenty-six years old when he took charge of the Carthaginian forces in Spain. His father and his brother-in-law had left him with an excellent army and productive mines. He was ready to carry out his vow. Now on the eastern coast of Spain there was a town, Saguntum, with which Rome had made a defensive alliance, doubtless for the very purpose of setting a limit to Punic expansion. By besieging and capturing Saguntum Hannibal deliberately brought on war with Rome. He knew that Rome made it a rule to protect her allies. True to this principle, Rome at once sent an ambassador to Carthage with a demand for the surrender of Hannibal. As Carthage was too proud to yield, Rome declared war. The immediate cause of this Second Punic War (218–202 B.C.) was Hannibal's desire to avenge his father's defeat. Underlying this immediate cause, however, was a general cause — the rivalry between the two powers of Rome and Carthage for control of the western Mediterranean.

Hannibal Crosses the Alps. — Rome prepared to use her sea-power by shipping an army to Spain and a larger force to attack Carthage itself. Hannibal, however, started out with a picked army of hardened veterans to march north through Spain, over the Pyrenees, across southern Gaul (France), over the Alps, to Italy. It was an audacious plan, but no other promised success. He had no strong fleet to attack Rome by sea. On the other hand, if he attacked by land, entering Italy from the north, perhaps he could gain support from the Gauls in northern Italy, and perhaps even the Italian "allies" of Rome would welcome him as a liberator.

Crossing the Alps was a terrific ordeal. Hostile mountaineers hurled rocks upon the army as it threaded its way through narrow ravines. Thousands of the soldiers, accustomed to the climate of Spain or Africa, perished of cold and hunger in this land of rocky mountains, snow, and glaciers. When Hannibal finally descended from the Alps into the Po Valley, it was with only half his army. The weary survivors looked more like gaunt shadows than men.

Invasion of Italy. — With only twenty thousand foot-soldiers and six thousand horsemen (most of the war elephants were lost in the Alps), Hannibal invaded a country that had 280,000 able-bodied Roman citizens liable to military service and perhaps twice that number of Italian allies. Fortunately for him, however, Rome at this time was in the habit of putting only forty thousand men in the field at a time, and the Roman legions had grown rusty during years of peace. The first Roman army he met, in the Po Valley, was easily routed.

Moreover, the Gauls in the Po Valley welcomed the invader. It should be explained that four years previously (222 B.C.) Rome had subdued the Gauls in this region, which was called Cisalpine Gaul ("Gaul on this side of the Alps"). The Gauls were almost as eager as Hannibal to strike back at their conqueror. As Hannibal expected, they flocked to his standard. After spending the winter in the Po Valley, he was able to resume his march on Rome with about twenty-five thousand tall Gauls in addition to his Spanish and African veterans.

The Crisis and Fabius. — A Roman army on its way to check him was caught unawares and practically wiped out, in a battle — it might better be called a massacre — near Lake Trasimeno (trä-zē-mā′nō). It is easy to imagine the panic at Rome. Two armies of forty thousand men had been suddenly annihilated by this irresistible enemy, this namesake of the hungry Baal. Rome met the crisis by raising a new army and appointing a dictator, Fabius (fā′bĭ-ŭs), a middle-aged and cautious aristocrat. Fabius knew that his own raw recruits were no match for Hannibal's veterans. Nor did he intend to be caught in a trap, as two earlier armies had been. For months Fabius followed Hannibal, ever wary, ever near, but never willing to engage in a decisive battle,

even though he saw the enemy devastating Italy's fairest provinces. Romans nicknamed him "*Cunctator*" (the Lingerer); moderns still use the adjective "Fabian" to describe a cautious policy of watchful waiting. The caution of Fabius was doubtless wise, but in time the Romans grew impatient and decided on a bolder strategy.

Cannæ. — By a mighty effort Rome doubled the size of the army and intrusted it to two consuls with orders to defeat Hannibal. On a narrow plain in the bend of a river near Cannæ (kăn′ē) the battle was fought (216 B.C.). The Romans outnumbered the enemy but Hannibal had superior cavalry and genius. By brilliant strategy he surrounded the Roman army and drove the legions together into a crowded, disordered mass, so that the men in the center of the crowd were unable to use their weapons at all, while the men on the edges were being slaughtered. Ancient historians tell us that fifty thousand Romans and Italians were slain on the field, and ten thousand captured. When runners brought the news to Rome the people gave way for a moment to grief and panic, but the Senate forbade the women to weep in public for lost husbands or sons. The walls were prepared for siege. New legions were raised, what though beardless boys and eight thousand slaves had to be conscripted to fill the ranks. At any moment, the people feared, Hannibal might come to besiege the city.

Rome Unconquered. — Yet Hannibal did not come. His cavalry could win battles in the field but could not ride through Rome's walls of stone. To batter down those walls battering-rams were needed, and catapults to hurl heavy stones. Hannibal had not brought such equipment for sieges with him across the Alps. Rather than shatter his army against the walls of Rome, he planned to wait until Rome's allies deserted the lost cause. With their help it would be easier to strike the final blow. The great cities of Syracuse and Capua, and a number of smaller towns and tribes, did desert Rome.

Rome was clearly defeated, yet some of her older allies remained loyal, and the Senate held grimly to its purpose. Year by year more legions were mustered, and heavier taxes were levied. Since the farmers were fighting while the farmlands lay waste, grain had

to be imported at ruinous prices, until Ptolemy of Egypt generously aided the city with Egyptian wheat.

Crippled though she was, Rome raised troops to besiege Capua and Syracuse. At all costs they must be punished for desertion, as a lesson to the remaining allies. Syracuse was besieged and looted, its marble statues being taken to Rome and its lands appropriated.[1] Capua, too, was blockaded, starved to surrender, and its people were moved to other parts of the country.

The Fate of Hasdrubal. — Meanwhile a small Roman army in Spain was endeavoring to prevent reinforcements from being sent to Hannibal. A young patrician general, Publius Cornelius Scipio (sĭp′ĭ-ō), was able even to seize the chief Carthaginian town, New Carthage, in Spain. But he could not prevent Hannibal's younger brother Hasdrubal from slipping out of Spain with an army and following Hannibal's path over the Alps into Italy. Hannibal was in sore need of such reinforcements. He had never lost a battle, but he had lost men. As the Carthaginian government was unable or unwilling to send him fresh troops by sea, he had quartered his dwindling army in southern Italy, waiting for Rome's surrender or Hasdrubal's arrival. At the Metaurus River, however, Hasdrubal was met by Roman legions, defeated, and killed. With a brutality bred of long years of bloodshed, the Romans announced Hasdrubal's fate by flinging his head into Hannibal's camp.

Scipio's Victories. — Slowly Rome's perseverance was changing despair into hope. Hannibal remained in southern Italy, undefeated but weakening. The Roman system of alliances was still unbroken, and the deserting cities had been punished. On the seas Roman fleets were supreme. In Spain young Scipio was destroying the main source from which Hannibal's army had been recruited. Returning to Rome victorious, Scipio was given an army and a fleet with which he sailed to attack Carthage. His victories in Africa compelled Carthage to sue for peace and recall Hannibal from Italy.

[1] It was in this siege that the engines of Archimedes prolonged the struggle, and when the city fell the great scientist was killed by a Roman soldier. On Archimedes, see p. 237.

Hannibal's Failure. — Hannibal had been in Italy fifteen years, without losing a single battle, and without conquering Rome, though on one occasion he had come within three miles of the city's gates. He had entered Italy proclaiming his intention to free the country from Rome, but on finding the Italians loyal to Rome he had systematically laid the country waste. Immense areas of prosperous farmland were now overgrown with weeds. Many a great city, especially in southern Italy, stood in ruins, with only a handful of inhabitants. Thousands of Spanish skeletons lay among the Alps, and hundreds of thousands of men had been killed in battle. Such was the price paid for vengeance by the greatest military genius of the ancient world. And paid in vain!

Scipio's Triumph. — When Hannibal returned to Africa he must have persuaded the Carthaginian government to prolong the war, as we next find him in command of a hastily collected army, for which his own veterans provided the backbone. On the field of Zama (zā′mȧ) he met Scipio and defeat for the first time. The war was over. Well might the victor call himself Scipio Africanus and return to Rome to ride in triumph through the Forum to the temple of Jupiter, there to sacrifice the Carthaginian war elephants that lumbered in his train. Never had there been such a triumph.

Peace Terms. — The terms of peace (201 B.C.) required Carthage to pay an indemnity of ten thousand talents ($12,000,000) — not nearly enough to repay what Rome had spent or to compensate for the pillaging of Italy. Primarily, however, the Romans desired to prevent any future Punic war of revenge. Carthage must surrender all her warships save ten, and all her war elephants. She must never again wage war without Rome's consent. Moreover, a large strip of territory (Numidia) west and south of Carthage was given to Masinissa (măs′ĭ-nĭs′ȧ), a prince friendly to Rome; the Romans rightly expected that he would be a thorn in the side of their enemy. Finally, all Carthaginian possessions in Spain were handed over to Rome as a tributary province. Rome now had three tribute-paying possessions — Sicily, Sardinia and Corsica, and Spain.[1]

[1] Macedonia had taken most of Illyria during the war. Since the desertion and siege of Syracuse, eastern as well as western Sicily now paid tribute to Rome.

Hannibal's Later Career. — As for Hannibal, it is more than a little surprising that he was able to win favor in Carthage, even after this disastrous war. Yet he held a high office in the Carthaginian government until Rome insisted on his being exiled. Then he went east to stir up new enemies against Rome. He finally took poison to avoid being captured by the Romans.

Cato's Propaganda. — The last chapter of the story of Carthage comes half a century later. During the interval, the Carthaginians regained much of their prosperity, and their courage revived sufficiently so that they dared defy Rome and violate the treaty of 201 B.C. by fighting Masinissa, the pro-Roman king of Numidia. In Rome, on the other hand, the old hatred and fear of Carthage had returned. The leader of the anti-Carthaginian faction was a stern old farmer of a wealthy plebeian family. He was not an attractive figure, this Cato (kā′tō). As censor he earned a reputation for extreme severity, because he was so strict in omitting from the lists of senators and knights (cavalrymen) any persons of whose conduct in private life he disapproved. We find him continually making speeches against Romans who showed any fondness for Greek art or philosophy, or for luxury. He desired the Romans to remain farmers and soldiers, hardy, thrifty, and stern. A hard man he was, who could regard women as little better than slaves, and could recommend that slaves when weakened with age and toil should be sold lest they become an expense. Some historians believe Cato hated Carthage chiefly because he feared the old enemy might once more grow strong enough to menace Rome. Some accuse him of a lower motive. Cato was one of those Roman farmers who were growing grapes for wine, olives for oil, and fruits. When he visited Carthage, he saw splendid vineyards and orchards there and realized that these meant competition with Italian oil and wine. He revealed his motive when he brought a quantity of fine Carthaginian figs to show to other Roman farmers in the Senate as proof of the enemy's revival. Carthage, he decided, must be destroyed. Once the stern old censor made up his mind, he continued to harp on the theme, and for years he ended every speech with the fateful words, *Carthago delenda est* ("Carthage must be destroyed").

Third Punic War. — In the end he had his way. Rome waited until Carthage took up arms against Masinissa. That provided a pretext for sending Roman legions to Africa. The Third Punic War (149–146 B.C.) was begun. In terror the Carthaginians yielded to the Roman demand that they surrender their arms and hand over three hundred nobles as hostages. Then a Roman consul informed them that the city must be destroyed, but that they could build new homes wherever they chose, provided the place was at least ten miles from the coast. When the populace heard the terrible news men rushed to the armory, only to find the arms gone. Furiously the people took every scrap of iron they could find, and beat it into weapons. They closed the city gates and manned the walls. Carthage would not be destroyed without a struggle.

Destruction of Carthage. — Two long years the Roman army besieged the city in vain. Only in the third year did the Romans break into the town, and even then several days of house-to-house fighting prolonged the resistance. One can imagine the horrors of those days if one remembers that out of a population of half a million or more, only fifty thousand were left to surrender and to be sold as slaves. The city itself was plundered and burned; temples and houses alike were levelled to the ground; a plough was driven over the ruins; and a solemn curse was pronounced on anyone who should ever rebuild the city. The territory of Carthage was annexed by Rome as the province of "Africa." So ended the last of the Punic Wars.

Results of the Punic Wars. — The general effects of the Punic Wars were of the utmost importance. (1) The victory of the legions meant that the ancient civilization of the Mediterranean world would come down to us through Europe rather than through Africa.

(2) Rome emerged from the Punic Wars a great power. To her legions she had added a navy. To Italy she had added the subject provinces of Sicily, Sardinia and Corsica, Spain, and finally "Africa" (Carthage). In the western Mediterranean she was supreme.

(3) A third result was Philhellenism (fondness for Hellenism). By bringing Roman legions into Sicily, the first Punic War had opened the eyes of Roman soldiers to the culture, the marble temples and statues, the paintings, the theaters, that made Hellenic

cities so different from Rome.[1] Shortly after this war, Greek plays were translated into Latin and presented in Rome. The Second Punic War brought about the siege and pillage of Syracuse, Capua, and Tarentum, and from these Greek cities a wealth of statues and other works of art were carried to Rome. Enthusiasm for Greek art and literature, and for Greek luxury too, swept over the Roman upper classes so contagiously that the chronic complaints of Cato against the fad for Hellenism proved futile and in the end the crabbed censor himself studied Greek.

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

A Græco-Roman Bowl

The bowl was made by Nicephor, a Greek workman, for a certain Roman named Perennius. It dates from about the beginning of the Christian era, and is of interest as showing the adoption of Greek art and culture by the Romans.

(4) Finally, the Punic Wars hastened the development of class conflicts in Rome. During the wars the Senate had taken charge of diplomacy and military affairs to such an extent that the popular assemblies and plebeian tribunes were completely overshadowed. This political revival of aristocracy was paralleled in economic life by a rapid growth of the wealth of rich men. War usually affords opportunities for shrewd contractors to amass fortunes. The Punic War not only had this effect, but also weakened the peasantry.

The Land Problem. — Hannibal's invasion left Rome with a much reduced population and a greatly increased public domain consisting of ruined and confiscated farmland. As there were not enough men to reoccupy the land as small farmers, the government

[1] Rome had previously had some commercial contact with Greek civilization and had been influenced by the culture of the Greek cities in southern Italy. But the glories of such a Sicilian Greek city as Syracuse made a more profound impression on the Romans.

adopted the policy of leasing vast sections to wealthy contractors, who went into large-scale cattle-ranching. On such estates there was an alarming growth of slave labor. Moreover, great quantities of grain were imported from the newly conquered provinces of Sicily, Sardinia, and Africa. This must have reduced the price of wheat and injured small Italian farmers who were unable to engage in mass-production. Men with capital could transform their wheat-fields into profitable vineyards or olive orchards, but poorer peasants could not. Many lost their hold on the soil, and were forced into the class of discontented, landless proletarians. Economic conditions, in short, were ripening for class conflicts and upheavals. These will be dealt with in another chapter. Meanwhile, we must continue with the story of Rome's wars of conquest.

The Roman Conquest of the Hellenistic East

Hellenistic States in the East. — While in the West Rome was fighting her Punic Wars, Hellenistic civilization was flourishing in the lands of the eastern Mediterranean. As we explained in Chapter VII,[1] the Empire established by Alexander the Great in the fourth century B.C. had been divided by his generals, after his death. Ptolemy had become king of Egypt; Antigonus, of Macedonia; and Seleucus, of Western Asia. These three kingdoms remained the great powers of the eastern Mediterranean throughout the third century and well into the second century B.C. The Antigonid dynasty (that is, the kings descended from Antigonus) in Macedonia, the Ptolemaic dynasty (descendants of Ptolemy) in Egypt, and the Seleucids in Syria, were of Græco-Macedonian ancestry and quite thoroughly Hellenistic if not Greek in culture. Greek was the language of the royal court, of the government, of literature, philosophy, and science. Greek art and learning were patronized by all three monarchies. Shrewd Greek business men and clever Greek teachers were found everywhere. Of course the common people in Syria and Egypt did not become Greek, but, if we look only at the ruling classes, the eastern Mediterranean was a Greek world.

[1] See p. 229.

Athens. — Besides the three great kingdoms there existed a multitude of minor states. The old Greek love of local independence kept cropping out. Most of the ancient cities of the Greek Peninsula had become free once more. Athens had lost her power and her commercial supremacy, but was still renowned as the home of philosophy, and was regarded with singular veneration. Indeed, the rulers of Egypt, Syria, and other Hellenistic states vied with each other in erecting at Athens temples more magnificent and larger than the Parthenon, though probably not in such good taste. To be a generous benefactor of Athens was to show one's self a patron of culture.

Other Hellenistic States. — The Greek city-states in the Peloponnesus, excepting Sparta, hoping to find strength in federal unity, had organized a confederation known as the Achæan League. Military affairs and diplomacy were entrusted to a federal general and an executive council, but each city continued to enjoy home rule in most matters, and the federal legislative assembly was a very clumsy body, including all men over thirty years of age who cared to take the trouble of attending. Somewhat similar was the Ætolian (ē-tō′lĭ-ăn) League, which included a considerable part of northern and central Greece.

To complete the picture of the Hellenistic world just before Rome entered it, we must at least add that a number of Greek cities in the Ægean had become subject to Egypt; that the Greek island of Rhodes had become a very important center of commerce, culture, and diplomacy; and that in western Asia Minor the city of Pergamum was rapidly becoming not only a home of Greek art but also the capital of a fairly powerful kingdom.

Reasons for Roman Intervention. — Such was the situation at the end of the third century B.C., when Rome emerged victorious from the decisive Second Punic War. Hardly had the struggle ended, before the Roman Senate was deluged with appeals to aid various Hellenistic states against King Philip V of Macedonia. Philip, it appeared, cherished the insane dream of duplicating the career of Alexander the Great. He had attacked Egypt and was encroaching on the territories of his neighbors. Egypt, Rhodes, Pergamum, Athens, and the Ætolian League all appealed to Rome

for aid against his aggressions. Surely the vigorous military state of the West was the one power that could check the Macedonian.

The Roman people, however, had had enough bloodshed and war taxes. The Assembly at first voted against embarking on a new war. But there were strong forces drawing Rome into the whirlpool of Hellenistic rivalries. Some of the most influential Roman families had become very enthusiastic admirers of Greek culture, as we have already explained, and naturally they were eager to have their own country recognized by the Greeks as a friendly and civilized power. Moreover, it was argued, Rome should show her gratitude to the king of Egypt, who had sent grain to the starving city during Hannibal's invasion. Above all, Philip of Macedonia had shown his unfriendliness by allying himself with Hannibal, and if he conquered the eastern lands he might easily become a menace to Italy. It was the last argument that won over the Assembly.

Rome Protector of the Greeks. — Before resorting to arms, the Roman Senate sent an ultimatum to Philip, demanding that he stop attacking the Greek states, and that he refer his disputes with Rhodes and Pergamum to peaceful arbitration. On his refusal, a Roman consul led two legions across the Adriatic, to join the Greek forces against Macedonia. The victory of the legions over Philip's phalanx at the hills of Cynoscephalæ (sĭn′ŏs-sĕf′ȧ-lē) (meaning Dog's Heads) in 197 B.C. proved to the world that the military organization inherited from the all-conquering Alexander had met its superior. More important, it made Rome the arbiter of Hellenistic affairs. Henceforth the destinies of the Greek-speaking world would be settled in the Forum near the Tiber. In this instance, the Philhellenes at Rome astonished the Greeks by an act of remarkable generosity. Rome might easily have taken Greek or Macedonian territory. Instead, she asked only an indemnity to cover part of the expense of the campaign. At the Isthmian Games[1] of 196 B.C., in the presence of delegations

[1] These were held at Corinth every alternate year and resembled the more famous Olympian Games, which were held at Olympia every fourth year. The Pythian Games at Delphi and the Nemean Games at Nemea were similar Panhellenic contests.

that had come from the various Greek states to witness the athletic and musical contests, the Roman consul publicly announced that Corinth and the other Greek states formerly subject to Macedonia were now to be free, thanks to the Roman victory. After aiding the leading property-owners in the emancipated cities to set up rather aristocratic governments, the consul returned to Italy with his legions. Rome had become the champion and protector of the Greeks.

Rome and Antiochus. — In the same spirit Rome dealt with Antiochus (ăn-tī′ŏ-kŭs) the Great, the Seleucid King of Syria. Under previous rulers the Seleucid monarchy had lost its grip on Asia Minor and Persia and had retained only Syria and Mesopotamia.[1] The transfer of the royal court from the banks of the Tigris to the Syrian city of "Antioch the Golden" symbolized the fact that Syria had become the center of gravity in the Seleucid realm. Antiochus, however, displayed extraordinary energy and ability in his successful efforts to regain the lost eastern provinces and part of central Asia Minor. With unsatisfied ambition, he wrested Palestine and various Greek cities in Asia Minor from Egypt, and then crossed over into Thrace. No power in Europe could stop him, except Rome. And Rome, in accordance with her new policy of protecting the independence of the small Greek city-states, informed Antiochus that he must stay in Asia. "No Greek shall henceforth be attacked by any man nor serve any man." So the message ran.

Defeat of Antiochus. — Antiochus, however, was urged on by the Ætolian League, which promised to help him subdue Greece, and by Hannibal, who had been defeated and exiled from Carthage but was still plotting against his old enemy. By invading Greece with ten thousand soldiers, Antiochus openly defied Rome. On the famous battlefield of Thermopylæ he learned that his Asiatic army was no match for Roman legions. Next year, Scipio Africanus and his brother led a Roman army into Asia Minor, defeated Antiochus again (at Magnesia, 190 B.C.), and brought him to his knees. By the peace treaty he was compelled to surrender his warships and elephants, pay an indemnity, and evacuate all

[1] See pp. 229, 230, 354.

territory north of the Taurus Mountains. In other words, he was crippled, confined to Syria and Cilicia (southern Asia Minor), and forbidden to attack Ægean and European states.

Rome's Policy. — In all this Rome showed no desire to conquer new territory. The Roman armies returned home heavy-laden with booty from their campaigns, but the defeated countries were left independent as "friends" (*amici*) of Rome, instead of being reduced to the position of subject provinces.[1] The aim of Philhellenic Roman statesmen at this period was not to annex the Hellenistic world, but to pacify it, to establish a balance of power among the dozens of Hellenistic states, large and small, and to prevent any one state from becoming too powerful.

Difficulties of This Policy. — This method of settling the Eastern question was highly satisfactory to Philhellenic Roman aristocrats like the Scipios, and wonderfully advantageous to Greek trading cities like Rhodes and Corinth, but for more than one reason it could not be permanent.

(1) Conservative Romans such as Cato could not sympathize with wars fought for Greek independence. The Greeks, Cato never tired of complaining, were corrupting Rome with their vices, luxuries, and newfangled philosophies. Indeed, Cato dared even accuse Scipio Africanus of accepting bribes from Antiochus, and Scipio's brother of embezzling public money. Haughtily as he rebuked such charges, Scipio was practically compelled to retire from political life. The anti-Hellenic attitude of Cato was further strengthened by the unwillingness of the people to pay taxes for Eastern wars that resulted in no gain of territory, as well as by the scorn that many Romans felt for the servile flattery and subtleties of the Greeks.

(2) A second difficulty was that the Roman consuls and the Roman Senate generally aided the aristocratic factions in the Greek city-states and fostered aristocratic governments controlled by the wealthy classes. As a result, the democratic party in each Greek state became anti-Roman, and in some cases the

[1] The Ætolians, by way of exception to the rule, were compelled to become "allies," sending troops to the Roman army and accepting Rome's leadership in diplomacy and war.

democrats looked for assistance to Macedonia, whose king was known to be hostile to Rome.

(3) Finally, the Greek states continued the bickering that had characterized all Greek history. They simply could not live in peace. It was bad enough when the Achæan League upset Rome's peace arrangements by defeating Sparta, destroying her city walls, redistributing her land, and incorporating her into the league. It was worse when King Perseus (pûr′sūs) of Macedonia showed

A Græco-Roman Painting
From Pompeii.

unmistakable signs of encouraging the anti-Roman factions in the Greek states and of preparing to disturb the peace.

Subjection of Macedonia. — Convinced that Perseus was preparing for war, the Roman Senate demanded his submission. When he refused, a Roman army put an end to his reign (168 B.C.). This time Rome showed a new spirit in dealing with Macedonia. The kingdom was broken up into four republics paying annual tribute to Rome. The royal estates, mines, and timberlands became Roman public property, to be worked for the government by contractors. All Greek states that had shown sympathy with Perseus were severely punished; in one case, 150,000 inhabitants were sold into slavery. And a thousand prominent persons in the Achæan League, who offered to prove that they had not conspired

to aid Perseus, were taken to Rome and retained as hostages for seventeen years. Clearly Rome was removing the velvet glove that had hitherto concealed her iron hand.

Annexation of Macedonia. — The iron hand was used more brutally a generation later, when the Achæan hostages returned to Greece, embittered by their long and unjustified captivity. It happened that just about this time Rome embarked on the Third Punic War (149–146 B.C.). Here was an opportunity for the Achæan League to attack Sparta again in defiance of Rome, for the latter was busy with the siege of Carthage. In these same years an adventurer claiming to be Perseus's son set himself up as king of Macedonia, likewise defying Rome. The Romans, however, were not to be disobeyed with impunity. Roman legions again crossed the Adriatic. The Macedonian upstart was promptly overthrown, and Macedonia now became a Roman province under a Roman governor.

Punishment of Corinth. — Then the Achæans were defeated. By looting and burning the beautiful city of Corinth, selling its inhabitants as slaves and confiscating its land as public property, Rome sought to teach the Greeks to fear her vengeance. The destruction of Corinth proved that Rome was no longer a generous friend, but a cruel mistress. Although shiploads of priceless marble statues taken from Corinth helped to beautify the imperious city on the Tiber, the ashes of the older city left a shameful blot on the history of Roman imperialism. Corinth and Carthage, both commercial rivals[1] of Rome, were pillaged and burned in the same year, 146 B.C.

The Greeks as Allies. — The Achæan League, in punishment for its disobedience, was dissolved but not annexed by Rome. Still remembering her promise of freedom to the Greeks, Rome allowed the cities of the Greek Peninsula to remain independent in theory as her "allies," but, as we have already explained, Rome's "allies"

[1] It has been denied that commercial rivalry was an important factor in the destruction of these two cities. Professor Rostovtzeff, however, has demonstrated that the Roman landowners were heavily interested in the export of olive oil and wine, and in this trade they undoubtedly encountered lively Corinthian and Carthaginian competition.

were really dependent states, obliged to aid her with troops in her wars. For about sixty years the situation in the East remained almost unchanged. The lesson of Corinth was not quickly forgotten. Under the shadow of Rome's superior power, the Hellenistic states around the eastern Mediterranean usually referred their disputes to the Roman Senate.

Asia and Cyrene. — During this period from 146 to 89 B.C. Rome acquired two Eastern provinces, but by inheritance rather than by conquest. First the king of Pergamum bequeathed his realm to the Senate and people of Rome, at his death. Thus the northwestern quarter of Asia Minor became the Roman province of "Asia" in the year 133 B.C. In the same way the king of Cyrene (the African coastland west of Egypt) bequeathed his territory to Rome thirty-six years later (97 B.C.).

Mithradates. — As time dimmed the memory of Corinth's fate, democratic politicians in several Greek city-states once more began to hope for deliverance from Roman control and from the oligarchical governments kept in power by Rome. Meanwhile the little kingdom of Pontus, on the southern coast of the Black Sea (called the Pontus by the Greeks), had been growing. Its ambitious king, Mithradates[1] (mĭth′rȧ-dā′tēz) — a Persian with a Greek education — desired to push his frontiers southward at the expense of Rome's "friends" in Asia Minor, but dared not attempt it until he heard that a civil war had broken out in Italy, in 89 B.C.[2] Thinking Rome would be unable to punish him, Mithradates now conquered various states friendly to Rome (Cappadocia, Galatia, and Bithynia), invaded the Roman province of Asia, and decreed a massacre of all Italians in Asia Minor. Some 80,000 persons are said to have been butchered. He also sent an army to Athens, to "emancipate" Greece, and

[1] His name means "Gift of Mithras" (the Persian sun-god). Mithradates is the subject of many romantic stories. It is said that by taking increasing doses of various poisons he rendered himself immune from poison. He was in reality a suspicious oriental despot, ever in fear of assassination, and ever willing to murder those whom he suspected of designs on his life or his throne. Even his brother, his mother, his sister, his sons, his closest advisers, and his wives were put to death by this murderous monarch.

[2] The so-called Social War; see Chapter X, pp. 311–312.

many Greek cities gave him aid, seeing in him a possible deliverer from Roman overlordship.

Sulla in Asia and Greece, 87–83 B.C. — As soon as the civil war in Italy was ended, a Roman fleet sailed east under the command of an able general, Sulla (sŭl′*a*), of whom we shall hear more in the next chapter.[1] Swift and sure was the punishment meted out to Mithradates and his allies. Mithradates was soon defeated and compelled to relinquish his conquests. Athens and many other Greek cities were captured and looted by Roman soldiers. And an indemnity of unprecedented magnitude — 20,000 talents, or $24,000,000 — was imposed on rebel cities in Roman Asia. Such an indemnity they could pay only by borrowing the money from Roman bankers at an extremely high rate of interest. Yet Mithradates had courage or folly enough to renew the struggle a few years later, after Sulla's death. Inevitably he was defeated by Roman legions and driven out of his kingdom of Pontus, as we shall soon see.



SULLA

Publicans and Taxes. — The Mithradatic wars in the East had been costly and, to many Romans, far from satisfactory. Partic-

[1] See Chapter X, pp. 312–313.

ularly disgruntled were the Roman "publicans."[1] These were wealthy capitalists who formed companies for the profitable business of obtaining contracts for public works. When Rome acquired her province of "Asia," publican companies collected the taxes (tithes and tribute) for the government. The Gracchan Law[2] of 123 B.C. provided that the Roman censors (who had charge of the census and tax collection in general) should let to the highest bidders the contracts for collecting the taxes in Asia. The successful bidder, usually a company, paid the Roman treasury a lump sum, and then endeavored to collect from the taxpayers that amount plus a margin of profit. The publicans often accepted grain in payment of taxes; they frequently managed to receive it at low summer prices, and sell it at high winter prices. In normal times the profits were exceedingly handsome, but wars and rebellions meant ruinous losses. What the publicans wanted was not a confusing system of "allies" and "friends" in Asia, but peaceful and orderly Roman provinces paying regular taxes. When Sulla tried to reform the tax system by fixing definite sums which each district must pay, he doubtless aimed to eliminate the publicans and their profits.

Pompey's Annexations. — But after Sulla's death the publicans found a leader after their own heart — Pompey.[3] As consul in the year 70 B.C., Pompey restored the profitable Gracchan system. Three years later (67 B.C.) he waged war on the pirate bands that had been preying on Mediterranean commerce. When he had completed the task, he disposed of his piratical captives by giving them farmlands and ordering them to become farmers. For this purpose he annexed part of Syria as a Roman province.

From such a man the publicans could hope for much. There is no doubt that they gave their powerful political support to a bill (the Manilian Law of 66 B.C.) conferring on Pompey not merely

[1] *Publicani.* In modern times they have often been called tax-farmers, this odd name being derived from the Latin word *firmus* (fixed or firm), since the publicans paid the government a fixed sum and then collected what they could from the taxpayers. Our word farmer, by the way, originally denoted not a man who owned a farm, but a man who paid a fixed sum of rent for a piece of agricultural land.

[2] On the Gracchi, see pp. 309–311. [3] On his career, see pp. 313–317.

command of the Roman legions in the East, but power to make war and peace. Pompey used this power in a manner that was entirely pleasing to the publicans. Advancing into Pontus he put Mithradates to flight and annexed the country as a Roman province. Armenia, farther east, became a dependent ally. Many petty states in the interior of Asia Minor were put into the class of tribute-paying dependencies. Next he transformed Syria and Palestine into a Roman province. Having completed these arrangements, he returned to Italy with cargoes of booty to display in his triumphal procession up the Sacred Road (see page 267).

What pleased the publicans was that in the new provinces of Pontus and Syria (including Palestine), as well as in the older provinces of Asia and Cilicia,[1] Pompey established a system of tax collection that meant profits. The provinces were divided into districts and the local native authorities did the actual collecting of taxes from individuals. But between the local authorities and the Roman treasury publican companies served as middlemen, paying the treasury a lump sum, and then collecting that sum and as much more as they could from the local authorities. Pompey's annexations more than quintupled the amount of taxes collected in Asia and the profits of the publicans who handled those taxes.

The Conquest of Gaul

Review of Conquests in West. — Although the Roman conquest of the Hellenistic East was not yet complete, we may well pause at this point and turn to the West. By way of review, it may be remembered that in the West the First Punic War (264–241 B.C.) had given Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica to Rome. The Second Punic War (218–202 B.C.) had led to the annexation of southern Spain, and the gradual conquest of the entire peninsula, except a small corner in the northwest.[2] Finally, the Third Punic War (149–146 B.C.) resulted in the annexation of "Africa" (Carthage).

[1] Cilicia in southern Asia Minor had been annexed 102 B.C. and the island of Cyprus had later been added to it.

[2] This process required a long series of punitive expeditions and wars (196–133 B.C.).

Meanwhile, Rome had gradually conquered all of northern Italy as far as the Alps, including the provinces of Liguria, Venetia, and Cisalpine Gaul.[1] The next step was the conquest of the remainder of Gaul, the large country now known as France but then called Transalpine Gaul ("Gaul across the Alps").

The Gauls. — Before we can follow this next step, some explanation is needed about the people of Gaul. About the origin of the Gauls we have no historical records, and therefore our statements are not much more than theories. It is supposed that from central Europe some tall, blue-eyed, blond-haired barbarians, speaking a language now called Celtic, pushed westward into the Rhine Valley and settled there, as well as in France. That was perhaps in the seventh century B.C. A little later they overflowed into the Po Valley, which the Romans later named Cisalpine Gaul. Venturesome bands of Gauls even went farther south, to attack Rome, as we remember.[2] Others sailed over the channel to the British Isles. Some crossed the Pyrenees and settled in Spain, where they intermarried with the natives, producing a mixed race (Celto-Iberians). Doubtless in France, Britain, and Italy, too, the fair-haired invaders mingled with the dark-haired natives, so that the people known to us in Cæsar's time as Gauls may have been of very mixed ancestry. About their culture we know more. If you go to any good museum you will see how skillful and in many cases artistic the Gauls were in their metal-work. They used iron as well as bronze; they could forge saws and safety-pins as well as swords. Yet, as compared with the Greeks and Romans, they were barbarians, without cities, without any architecture or sculpture worthy of the name, without literature, and even without any system of writing. Brave fighters they were in war, and a terror even to the well-disciplined Roman legions, but their loosely organized tribes had not yet learned that in unity there is strength. Consequently they offered no united resistance to the Romans. First the Romans conquered Cisalpine Gaul in the years 224–219 B.C. A century later, 121 B.C., they annexed the southern part of Transalpine Gaul, because they desired to build a road through it, connecting Italy with Spain.

[1] See p. 278. [2] See pp. 261–262.

German Migrations. — The Germans were a group of barbaric tribes, somewhat less civilized than the Gauls and speaking a different language. We first hear of them in northern Germany and in the other countries around the Baltic Sea. From their homeland, however, they rapidly expanded in all directions, as the Gauls had previously done. They were fond of fighting, too, and of plunder, as barbarians are wont to be. During the third and second centuries B.C., German tribes were gradually expelling the Gauls from the region east of the Rhine and north of the Main River. Soon they began to cross even these barriers. Tribes known as the Cimbri (sĭm′brī) and Teutones (tū′tō-nēz) invaded Roman Gaul, annihilated Roman armies totalling 60,000 men, ravaged Gaul and Spain, and then boldly invaded Italy, to be defeated and slaughtered there, by the Roman consul Marius (102 B.C.).[1] Other German tribes, gradually pushing southward up the Rhine, encroached on the lands of the Helvetians, a rather restless Gallic tribe living in the region of the Upper Rhine (southern Germany and Switzerland). The Helvetians decided to abandon their country and migrate westward.

Cæsar's Command in Gaul. — This was the situation when Julius Cæsar began the series of military campaigns which are known in history as Cæsar's Gallic Wars (58–51 B.C.). As Cæsar's political career will be discussed in the next chapter, we need only explain here that he was at this time an ambitious politician who realized that the road to power and prestige was the Sacred Road — in other words, that military triumphs would pave the way for political greatness. In the year 59 B.C. Cæsar obtained by vote of the Assembly and Senate the governorship of Cisalpine and Narbonese Gaul and Illyricum, and the command of four legions, for a term of five years, which he later had extended to ten. Doubtless Cæsar had far-reaching plans of conquest when he assumed his governorship in southern Gaul, but for fear of alarming the Senate he was careful not to appear too aggressive. In his own "Commentaries on the Gallic War," written to justify his deeds in the eyes of the Romans, he took no small pains to explain how each step in the war of conquest was both necessary and legal. One of

[1] See p. 311.

his first moves was to defeat the Helvetians and send them back home to hold the upper Rhine against the Germans.

Ariovistus. — Next Cæsar had to deal with a German chieftain named Ariovistus (ā-rĭ-ō-vĭs′tŭs). With fifteen thousand warriors of the Suevi (swē′vī) tribe, Ariovistus had ventured to cross the Rhine to fight in the pay of a Gallic chieftain. Cæsar defeated Ariovistus and halted German attempts to cross the Rhine.

Cæsar in Northern Gaul. — If Cæsar had been intent merely on preserving order in the frontier zone north of his provincial boundary, he might have been content with these successes. His plans were more ambitious. He accepted as "allies" a number of Gallic tribes whose chiefs had been awed by his victories. As Rome's custom was to protect her allies, and as the new allies were quite likely to be attacked by other tribes hostile to Rome, it requires no brilliant mind to perceive what Cæsar was planning. His alliances would give him legal pretexts for conquering all northern Gaul. That is precisely what happened. The confederacy of independent tribes known as the Belgians (Belgæ), in northern Gaul, attacked a tribe allied to Rome. Cæsar, of course, rushed to the ally's defense, defeated the Belgians, and thus made himself master of northern Gaul. Quickly his plan unfolded itself. While his aide was subduing the Aquitanians in southern Gaul, Cæsar himself was securing the north. He was determined, apparently, to conquer the whole region from the Pyrenees to the Rhine.

Cæsar in England. — He went even farther. Twice he crossed the English Channel (55 and 54 B.C.), but instead of making a permanent settlement in England he merely imposed a tribute on the native king — a tribute that was never paid.

Cæsar in Germany. — On another occasion, after slaughtering a large body of Germans who had crossed the lower Rhine into northern Gaul, Cæsar built his famous bridge across the Rhine and led his legions into Germany, perhaps with the purpose of allowing the Germans to see against what a foe they would have to fight if they again invaded Gaul. He did not attempt, however, to annex the lands east of the Rhine. The river was to be the boundary between Gauls and Germans, between Roman rule and barbarism. In those days of hand-to-hand fighting a river like the

Rhine was an excellent frontier, easily defended against any enemy that attempted to bridge or swim the stream.

Annexation of Transalpine Gaul. — Before his work in Gaul was complete, Cæsar had several rebellions to quell. These suppressed, he was able to declare all Transalpine Gaul, from the Pyrenees to the Rhine, and from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic, a Roman province.[1] With the possible exception of Spain, it was the largest conquest Rome had yet made. Cæsar did not have time to complete the organization of his new province, but he laid the foundations. His policy was to leave the sixty-odd Gallic tribes in possession of their lands, with their own chieftains and laws. A small tribute was laid upon them, but it was to be collected directly, rather than by extortionate tax-contractors. Indeed, Cæsar intended to conciliate and Romanize, rather than exploit, the Gauls. On many of their leaders he generously conferred Roman citizenship and administrative or military offices. He was the first Roman statesman to regard the Gauls not as terrible barbarians but as splendid material for the Roman legions, and as men who would make good Roman citizens if given proper treatment.

Cæsar and Militarism. — How Julius Cæsar returned from Gaul to Rome at the head of his victorious army, to make himself dictator, how he led an army to Egypt and was captivated by the charming Cleopatra, and how his plans for a great invasion of Persia, the land east of Syria, were cut short by the assassin's dagger, would make too long a story to be told in this chapter.[2] But before leaving Cæsar we should take note of the fact that he symbolizes the result of the slow and faltering expansion of the Roman Republic. By Cæsar's time Rome had mastered most of the Mediterranean world, and imperialist militarism was about to master Rome.

Roman Possessions about 50 B.C. — There were other conquests and annexations still to be made: Egypt, Britain, Mesopotamia, Mauretania, and a number of provinces carved out east of the Rhine and north of the Danube by later Roman emperors.

[1] The old Greek city of Massilia remained in the status of an ally a few years longer, and was then embodied in the province.

[2] See Chapter X, pp. 316–322.

These will be considered later. But by Cæsar's time Rome's provinces outside of Italy included Sicily, Sardinia and Corsica, Illyricum, Spain, Gaul, Macedonia, Asia (western Asia Minor), Pontus, Cilicia, Syria, Africa (Carthage), and Cyrene. In addition, the Greek Peninsula was under Roman control, the principalities of eastern Asia Minor were tributaries, and likewise Numidia, west of Carthage. Almost, but not quite, Rome had encircled the Mediterranean.



HEAD OF A ROMAN
First century, B.C.

Results of Roman Expansion. — The results of these conquests will appear more fully as we proceed with the story of the Roman Empire in another chapter. It may be convenient, however, to summarize four of them here.

(1) By her conquest of the more highly civilized Greek and Hellenistic lands, Rome learned to appreciate the culture of the Near East, and became partly Hellenized. The result was that Hellenistic culture, blended with Roman institutions, was spread throughout the Mediterranean world, West as well as East.

(2) Roman overlordship put an end to the enmities and wars of the Mediterranean states. Roman rule meant political unity and peace throughout the Mediterranean. The peace was a *Pax Romana*, a Roman Peace imposed by Roman arms, a peace of subjection rather than of freedom, but it had the immense advantage of allowing commerce to develop on a larger scale than ever before, and it enabled the Roman world to surpass all earlier civilizations in luxury, wealth, and magnificent cities.

(3) The increase of commerce and wealth, as we shall see, meant also that some of the rich became a great deal richer, and conflicts increased between rich and poor.

(4) With the rise of wealth on one hand and the growth of slavery and serfdom on the other hand, the very foundations of the Roman Republic were undermined. It was no longer a republic of farmers, but a government in which the slaves, the poor, and the rich struggled for power. And in that struggle the decisive element was the army — no longer a militia of farmers summoned from their fields to defend their homes, but a force of professional soldiers serving for the rewards that ambitious generals could promise them. With a loyal army behind him, a successful general could, if he chose, seize supreme power. That is precisely what Julius Cæsar did. By its conquests the republic created militarism, and militarism destroyed the republic by turning it into an autocratic Empire, an empire ruled by one man.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Compare Rome and Carthage at the beginning of the First Punic War as regards government, economic development, fighting power, culture.

2. What was the immediate cause of the First Punic War? Of the Second? Of the Third? Can you give any general reason or reasons for the occurrence of this series of wars? What were the results?

3. What was the influence of sea-power on the early wars of Rome? On the outcome of the Punic Wars? On the conquest of Sardinia and Corsica? On Roman interference in Greek affairs? On the Roman wars in Asia Minor and Syria? In general, would you consider sea-power a vital factor in Roman expansion?

4. Make a table showing the provinces conquered or subjected by Rome, from 264 to 50 B.C. During this period did Rome become more aggressive or less so? Can you suggest any reasons why?

5. Sketch the career of Hannibal. Why, in your opinion, did he fail to overthrow the power of Rome?

6. Discuss the policies of Cato, with special reference to Carthage and to Greece.

7. What were the chief Hellenistic states in the Near East at the end of the third century? What became of them?

8. How were the interests of Roman capitalists affected by Pompey's Near Eastern policy?

9. What was the situation in Gaul before Cæsar's governorship? Trace the steps by which Cæsar conquered Gaul. What was his policy toward the conquered Gauls?

SPECIAL TOPICS

The Roman army. MUNRO, *Source Book of Roman History*, ch. iii; SANDYS, *Companion to Latin Studies*, 459–464, 468–476, 482–489.

The Roman navy. SANDYS, *Companion to Latin Studies*, 489–500; POLYBIUS, *Histories*, Book i, paragraphs 20–28.

The First Punic War. FRANK, *Roman Imperialism*, ch. vi; or FRANK, *History of Rome*, 94–114; MUNRO, *Source Book of Roman History*, 79–84.

The Second Punic War. FRANK, *History of Rome*, 115–135; MUNRO, *Source Book of Roman History*, 84–88.

Hannibal's crossing of the Alps. POLYBIUS, *Histories*, Book iii, paragraphs 33–56.

Destruction of Carthage. POLYBIUS, *Histories*, Book xxxvi.

The Achæan and Ætolian Leagues. MAHAFFY, *Alexander's Empire*, 163–169, 176–183; BOTSFORD AND SIHLER, *Hellenic Civilization*, 610–625.

Cæsar's conquest of Gaul. FRANK, *Roman Imperialism*, ch. xvii; FERRERO, *Characters and Events of Roman History*, 71–99.

Athens in the second century B.C. FERGUSON, *Hellenistic Athens*, 307–311, 312–345.

Cato. FRANK, *Roman Imperialism*, 233–235; MUNRO, *Source Book of Roman History*, 95–97; PLUTARCH, *Cato*.

Roman society in the age of Cato. FRANK, *History of Rome*, 166–179.

Roman colonies. SANDYS, *Companion to Latin Studies*, 382–390.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR TEACHERS

T. FRANK, *Roman Imperialism*. T. FRANK, *Economic History of Rome*. G. FERRERO, *Greatness and Decline of Rome* (5 vols.), or his shorter *Characters and Events of Roman History*. T. R. HOLMES, *Cæsar's Conquest of Gaul*. A. HOLM, *History of Greece*, IV. R. B. SMITH, *Carthage and the Carthaginians*. W. W. HOWE, *Hannibal*. See also Chapter VIII.

CONVENIENT SOURCE MATERIALS

BOTSFORD, *Source-Book of Ancient History*. D. C. MUNRO, *Source Book of Roman History*. W. S. DAVIS, *Readings in Ancient History*. PLUTARCH, *Lives* (Fabius Maximus, Sulla, Pompey, Cæsar). POLYBIUS, *Histories*. CÆSAR, *Commentaries on the Gallic War*.

CHAPTER X

INTERNAL CHANGES IN THE ROMAN REPUBLIC

Economic and Social Changes

Not a Sudden Event. —The establishment of the Roman Empire was no sudden event accomplished by a Julius Cæsar or by any one man. In reality it was a gradual adjustment of the old republican city-state to meet new problems arising from more than two centuries of war and conquest. For that reason, it is necessary now to turn back and show how the wars described in the previous chapter affected Roman economic and political life during the period of about 262 years from the beginning of the First Punic War to the time when Octavian became the first of the long line of Roman Emperors.

Enrichment of Senatorial Class. — The wars of conquest greatly increased the wealth of the few blue-blooded families whose members filled most of the seats of the Senate and most of the high political and military offices. As consuls and generals, the senatorial aristocrats naturally appropriated a large share of the loot and slaves won in the war. Many a senator, too, served his term as governor of some conquered province and returned with a fortune acquired by what we would call "graft." Other men enlarged their fortunes by lending money at high interest rates.

Ranches, Plantations, and Villas. — The favorite investment for such new-found wealth was in large-scale agriculture. We have already noted how, after the Second Punic War, Rome found herself in possession not only of conquered provinces but also of an immense area of uncultivated land in Italy. A little of this public land was occupied by garrison-colonies; some was leased to individual farmers in lots of five hundred or a thousand *jugera* (333 to 666 acres); but a vast amount was simply occupied, without

formalities or rent, by wealthy cattle-ranchers. Senators possessing plenty of capital and numbers of slaves were thus able to go into cattle-raising on a very large scale. In some districts, too, they devoted the land to vineyards and olive orchards, for wine and olive oil were much in demand.

Naturally the wealthy owner of one or more large plantations or ranches no longer worked in the field; that he left to his slaves. Even the management and supervision of the estate was entrusted to an intelligent slave, while the landowner lived in luxury at Rome. When he visited his estate it was for a vacation from the dusty city. His country residence was no longer a one-room farmhouse, but a beautiful villa, with many rooms, with marble pillars and pleasant gardens, with baths and swimming pool, and bubbling fountains, with frescoed walls and mosaic floors. As wealth increased, it was not unusual for a senator to own half a dozen rural villages. The senatorial class, in short, became a group of plutocratic landowners, employing slave labor in large quantities along with some free hired labor, and indulging in luxury that was unheard of before the Punic Wars.

Greek Influence. — In this connection it must also be remembered that the Roman ruling class was eagerly reading Greek literature, employing Greek tutors, studying Greek philosophy, aping Greek manners and customs. Greek philosophy, needless to say, was an active force in destroying reverence for the old Roman gods and old-fashioned laws, customs, and morals. One could see the effect in the increase of divorces and loss of respect for the marriage bond, and in a thousand other ways. But here we wish to emphasize the point that Greek influence undermined respect for the republican constitution on the part of the very class that controlled the government, the senatorial class.

Rise of Bourgeois Capitalists. — The wars also stimulated the growth of a class of bourgeois capitalists. By bourgeois capitalists we mean rich city business men, as contrasted with the aristocratic landowners of the senatorial class. A capitalist is a person having a large amount of wealth which he invests in some kind of business, and capitalism is an economic system in which capitalists play an important part. The Roman capitalists to

whom we refer here were known as knights (*equites*). The knights were the newly rich, not yet admitted to the senatorial aristocracy. They were not all native Romans. Many were business men in the provinces, and many were freedmen (former slaves) of Greek or Syrian blood. They amassed wealth in various ways: by supplying the armies with food, clothing, wine, and arms; by buying booty and captives wholesale from the army and selling them retail; by obtaining government contracts to collect taxes, to build roads and aqueducts, to exploit public timberlands and mines; by lending money; by investing capital in industry, agriculture, shipping,[1] and trade. The publicans, to whom we have referred before,[2] were a particularly important group in this class of knights, because they were so actively interested in imperialistic policies. Pompey was one of their champions.



CICERO

Cicero. — The silver-tongued Cicero was the most gifted spokesman of the bourgeois capitalists. If you read his plea for the Manilian Law, in which he eloquently defends the interests of the publicans, or his letters to the governor and the quæstor of Bithynia, in which he similarly urges favors for publican corporations, you can hardly escape the conclusion that the famous orator might well be called in modern terms a corporation lawyer. His career suggests the political ambitions of the knights. They desired three things: (*a*) promotion of their business interests by the government; (*b*) protection against any attempts of the poor to have debts cancelled; (*c*) admission to the higher political

[1] Senators were forbidden by law to own seagoing vessels.

[2] See pp. 293–294.

offices and the Senate. Cicero himself forced his way up from the rank of knight, entered the Senate, and purchased the beautiful Tusculan villa of a prominent noble, thus incurring the dislike of snobbish aristocrats.

Decline of Peasantry. — While senators and knights were becoming wealthy capitalists, the Italian peasantry was declining. Peasants or farmers working on their own small farms had once been the backbone of the legions and of the state. But heavy losses in war reduced their numbers. Moreover, the importation of grain from Sicily and Africa to feed Rome compelled many small farmers to go out of business, and forced others to fall into debt. Of course there still remained large numbers of farmers, some of them independent, others tilling rented land as tenants of some knight or senator. The striking fact, however, is that Italy was becoming, more and more, a land of great estates and marble villas, of absentee landlords and non-Italian slaves, rather than of small farms and sturdy farmers.

Growth of Slavery. — Slavery has been mentioned several times, but it should be emphasized. All prisoners of war became slaves. In addition, thousands of persons were kidnapped by pirates[1] and sold in the slave market at Delos — the center of the slave trade. Most of the slaves brought to Italy were employed in cultivating olive orchards and vineyards or caring for cattle and sheep on the great plantations and ranches, or in turning out manufactured goods in industrial workshops for their owners' profit. Many, however, were domestic servants — cooks, waiters, pages, and the like. A few intelligent Greek slaves were used as scribes, to copy books, or as schoolmasters and tutors for young Romans, or even as advisers and companions of Roman gentlemen. It must be remembered that often a Greek captive was more highly educated than his Roman owner.

The growth of slavery enabled the rich to live in greater luxury, and to some extent slaves took the place of free farmers and craftsmen. It also enabled a rich man to have a bodyguard of armed slaves — ex-warriors — wherever he went, if he so desired. In-

[1] Julius Cæsar himself was kidnapped in this fashion, but escaped and later punished his captors.

deed, a millionaire like Pompey could form an army of fair size from his own slaves and tenants. As he said, he had but to stamp his foot on the ground to get thousands of soldiers. Such men could easily become a law unto themselves and a menace to the state.

The possibility of rebellion of the large alien slave population, among whom were many ex-soldiers, was also a menace. Such a rebellion, the Sicilian Slave War, occurred in the year 136 B.C. Another, thirty-two years later, lasted for three years.

The Army Becomes Professional. — On the other hand, the army of the republic was greatly altered by the social changes. Sending farmers to Asia or Gaul for five or ten years, away from their farms and families, was quite a different thing from the old practice of calling them out for a brief campaign near home after which they could return to their ploughing. Professional soldiers were needed, and professional generals too. Warfare had become too technical for inexperienced consuls serving a term of one year. Rome therefore had to substitute a professional army and professional generals for her farmer-legions and one-year consuls.

Roman Slums. — Meanwhile, the city of Rome was growing rapidly. Farmers who had sold or lost their land, slaves employed in industry and trade, and thousands of freedmen swelled the population until in the time of Cæsar the imperial city must have had between half a million and a million inhabitants, and had spread out into suburbs beyond the ancient walls. While in certain fashionable quarters, especially on the Palatine Hill, there were now handsome mansions, most of the city must have consisted of crowded, dirty slums. Many of the poor lived in tenement houses three or four stories high, owned by capitalists such as Cicero and Crassus. With the exception of the stone-paved main roads, the streets were merely narrow, crooked alleys.

The Proletariat. — The non-propertied classes in Rome, excluding slaves, were termed the proletariat. Most of them doubtless made their living by some form of manual labor or shopkeeping. There were gilds (*collegia*) or associations of shoemakers, painters, dyers, weavers, doctors, and teachers. There must have been many vegetable dealers, keepers of wine-rooms and grocery shops, bakers, foundrymen, masons, carpenters, porters,

and blacksmiths. But there were undoubtedly also many unemployed.

The Proletariat in Politics. — The growth of the proletariat had important political effects. As it was inconvenient if not impossible for Roman citizens outside Rome to attend all the sessions of the Assembly of Tribes, that body became a meeting of the Roman proletariat. And the proletariat had its own special interests. It wished, in general, to assert its own power through the Assembly and through the tribunes elected by the Assembly, as opposed to the authority of the aristocratic Senate. It generally favored leaders who promised to cancel debts or rents, or to distribute land

SOME OF THE PUBLIC BUILDINGS IN ANCIENT ROME
This picture, by a modern artist, shows how the central part of the ancient city probably appeared.

among the landless. Its members were easily bribed. But above all, the proletariat could be won over by any leader who would give it cheap grain, or, better still, free grain. Bread was the chief article in the diet of the common people, and in a city whose grain

supply came largely from overseas, bread was often dear and scarce. A storm at sea, delaying grain shipments from Sicily, might easily plunge the Roman populace into misery.

Demagogues and Dictators

In these circumstances it was not difficult for ambitious politicians to become dictators. With a proletariat easily won over by bribery or by promises of land, grain, and power; with a wealthy class of knights eager to obtain a larger share in the government; with the senatorial aristocracy determined to preserve its privileges against these opponents; and with successful military leaders thirsting for new triumphs, orderly constitutional government became more and more difficult. Demagogues who catered to the desires of the mob and dictators who boldly defied the constitution became increasingly frequent in the annals of the decaying republic.

Tiberius Gracchus and Land Reform. — The difficulties of the situation were clearly revealed by the careers of Tiberius (tī-bē′rĭ-ŭs) and Caius (kā′yŭs) Gracchus (grăk′ŭs). These brothers were not proletarian revolutionists, but members of a distinguished senatorial family, their father having been a consul and their grandfather a great general (Scipio Africanus). Yet these aristocrats became bold leaders of the proletariat against their own class.

Tiberius, the elder brother, was elected as tribune for the year 133 B.C. on a platform of land reform. In a campaign speech he declared that if the great plantations continued to grow, there would not be enough free farmers to fill the ranks of the legions; but if the large estates could be broken up, and the number of small farmers increased, the army would be strong enough to make the Romans "masters of the rest of the habitable world." He proposed that wealthy men who were using public lands as cattle ranches should be allowed to keep not more than 1000 *jugera* (666 acres) apiece. The remainder of the public lands should be distributed in small lots to landless Roman citizens, that is, proletarians, to whom the government should advance money for the purchase of farm implements and stock.

The wealthy senators who had appropriated vast tracts of public

land as ranches and plantations found an easy way to defeat the proposal. They simply got another tribune to veto it. Tiberius, however, persuaded the Assembly of Tribes to depose that tribune and pass the land bills. Moreover, in order to carry out the new laws he announced his intention of standing for re-election to the tribuneship for a second term, in defiance of the Senate and the constitution. This was too much for the Senate. A prominent senator with his friends and their armed slaves attacked Tiberius, and in the ensuing riot the reformer and several hundreds of his followers were killed. Shortly afterwards the senators managed to nullify the Gracchan land laws.

Reforms of Caius Gracchus. — Ten years later, however, another Gracchus was elected tribune, Caius, the younger and bolder brother of Tiberius. Not only did Caius have the Assembly of Tribes re-enact the land laws, but he passed other measures for the benefit of the proletariat. He improved the roads by which farm produce was brought to Rome. He planned to send landless Romans to found colonies at Carthage, Capua, and Tarentum. He took the very radical step of providing for the distribution of grain to the poor of Rome at half the market price. To obtain funds for such reforms he proposed a law to increase the tax revenue from the province of Asia. This measure indirectly was beneficial to the capitalist class, the knights, because Gracchus put the collection of the Asiatic taxes into the hands of publican contractors. To win the favor of the knights he also introduced a law depriving senators of the right to serve as jurors in the courts, and transferring this right to the knights. Still another important reform proposed (but not carried out) by Caius Gracchus was the extension of Roman citizenship to the Latin and Italian allies, that is, to all the people of Italy.

For a time the reformer was the idol of the proletariat and the political boss of Rome. Where his brother had failed to win the tribuneship a second time, Caius succeeded. But he also had his enemies, chiefly in the Senate. While he was absent from Rome, founding a colony at Carthage, his opponents rallied sufficiently to defeat his candidacy for a third term. On his return there were riots, and he was killed by senators and slaves (121 B.C.). A few

years later the Gracchan land laws were modified, the distribution of small lots was stopped, and the senatorial ranches and plantations were left untouched.

Marius and the Army. — The Gracchi failed to hold power because they depended on the votes of the proletarians without any army to defend them against the Senate. To be a successful dictator of Rome one needed to be both a political boss and a commander of an army. It was Caius Marius (mā′rĭ-ŭs) who showed future dictators the importance of the army. Unlike the Gracchi, Marius was not a member of the senatorial aristocracy, but a knight, who had made money as a contractor and gradually worked his way up the ladder of political offices and military rank. Elected as consul (107 B.C.), he made himself the man of the hour by crushing an insurrection in Africa (led by Jugurtha, king of Numidia), and by defeating two barbarian tribes that invaded Italy.[1] Marius was consul for six years, whereas Caius Gracchus had held power for only two. That was what it meant to have an army.



MARIUS

Italian Civil War. — After Marius had retired from politics, Italy was racked by a conflict which is sometimes known as the

[1] See Chapter IX, p. 297.

Social War or the Marsic War, but might better be named the Italian Civil War (90–88 B.C.). It was caused by the refusal of Rome to extend the franchise to the rest of Italy. The Italian allies rebelliously set up a federal republic with its capital at a town named Italia, and declared their independence. After three years of fighting, Rome put an end to the rebel confederacy, but her victory was won not so much by force of arms as by granting the Roman franchise to all who surrendered. Henceforth all Italians were Romans, and Italy was Rome.

Sulla. — One of the Roman generals who achieved fame in the Italian Civil War was Lucius Cornelius Sulla, a patrician of very blue blood but very little wealth, extremely popular with his troops. When the Roman government refused to give him command of an army for a campaign in Asia Minor, Sulla led his troops into the city and secured his appointment. Then he sailed for Asia Minor, to spend four years (87–83 B.C.) in the field.[1] On his victorious return with forty thousand soldiers and immense booty, Sulla found his political enemies, the followers of Marius, once more in power. They had even dared to confiscate his property, outlaw him, and massacre his friends. Again Sulla marched on Rome, defeating the armies that his opponents led against him, and entering the city in triumph. "Sulla the Happy" (*Felix*) he called himself, but "Sulla the Vengeful" might have been more appropriate. Day after day he posted up in the Forum a list of names of his opponents. Such persons were "proscribed," that is to say, outlawed. They could be killed by anyone, their property was confiscated, and their children were disfranchised. Several thousands were proscribed and murdered. As many of the victims were wealthy knights, the proscriptions enabled Sulla to reward his soldiers and friends with confiscated lands and villas.

Sulla's Dictatorship and Reforms. — As dictator of Rome during the years 82 to 79 B.C., supported by his army and by his fellow aristocrats, Sulla could perhaps have made himself king or emperor, but he was old-fashioned enough to have very different aims. His purpose was to restore the aristocratic rule of the Senate, with modifications that would adapt it to the needs of world empire.

[1] See p. 293.

To adapt the government to the needs of a great empire, Sulla increased the number of officials and courts, and systematized their duties. Although the number of consuls remained the same (two), the number of prætors (assistant consuls who presided over the courts) was increased from six to eight, and the number of treasurers (quæstors) from eight to twenty. After one year of service in Rome, the two consuls and eight prætors would become provincial governors with the title of proconsul or proprætor, respectively. The military duties of the consuls were to be transferred by the Senate to experienced generals.



POMPEY

Pompey. — Having enacted these reforms, Sulla retired to his beautiful villa, and died the next year, doubtless still believing that the revised constitution would insure stable government. As a matter of fact, his own example, showing that a general could seize power, was more influential than his laws. One of his own generals followed his example. Cnæus Pompey, a knight of plebeian family, had served with distinction as a general in Sicily and in Africa and had been rewarded by Sulla with the title of Magnus ("the Great"). After Sulla's death, Pompey suppressed a revolt

which had been stirred up in Spain by exiled Marians.[1] Returning to Rome seven years later, to celebrate his triumph and stand for election to the consulate, he found a rival in the field—"Crassus the Rich."

Crassus. — Marcus Licinius Crassus had amassed immense wealth by shrewd business ventures in the slave-trade, in silver mines, and in Roman real estate. Like Pompey, he had served as an army officer under Sulla. When a Thracian slave and gladiator, Spartacus by name, led a rebellion of gladiators and slaves in Italy, and defeated the consuls, Crassus volunteered to lead the Roman army against the rebels, and succeeded in defeating them.

Pompey and Crassus. — Both Pompey and Crassus demanded the privilege of celebrating triumphs and became candidates for election as consuls. Finding the Senate against them, they combined. Although both men had formerly been associated with Sulla's aristocratic faction and hostile to Marius and the proletariat, they were so eager to obtain support for their political ambitions that they were now willing to make a bargain with the Marian and proletarian leaders of the Roman Assembly. Backed by the proletariat, the knights, and their own victorious armies, Pompey and Crassus overawed the Senate and secured election as consuls for the year 70 B.C.

Pompey's Annexations. — Pompey's ambition, however, was not yet satisfied. After serving his year as consul he retired from office, to act unofficially as a sort of political boss, and to wait for opportunity to knock at his door. We have already seen how the pirates of the Mediterranean provided the opportunity, how Pompey obtained command of the Mediterranean and suppressed piracy (67 B.C.), and how he then secured unlimited power as commander in Asia and utilized that power by annexing several new provinces, for publicans to exploit.[2] Laden with spoils of war he returned to Rome (62 B.C.) to triumph as conqueror of Spain, Africa, and Asia. But he made the mistake of disbanding his army. As a result, he found the Senate unwilling either to ratify his actions in Asia or to yield to his demand for a grant of public lands to his soldiers.

[1] Persons belonging to the party formerly led by Marius.
[2] See pp. 294–295.

Cicero. — Among the three Roman politicians to whom Pompey might turn for help in this strait, one was the peerless orator, Cicero.[1] He had just served a term as consul (63 B.C.) and had defended the interests of the propertied classes by exposing and punishing the conspiracy of Catiline (a bankrupt and profligate noble who had recklessly plotted to seize power and wealth with the aid of debtors and desperadoes). Cicero, however, was at this time allied with the senatorial aristocrats, the very class that was opposing Pompey. Pompey might better turn to his former colleague, Crassus the Rich, and to the latter's clever young friend, Cæsar.

Cæsar in Politics. — Julius Cæsar was now about forty years old, a fairly influential politican, an accomplished orator and lawyer, as well as an experienced military officer. He had already held several public offices. But he had yet to celebrate a military triumph or wear the consul's robe. By birth he belonged to the proud patrician clan of the Julii, which claimed descent from kings and gods. Nevertheless in politics he was identified with the democratic party. His aunt Julia had been the wife of Marius, and his own wife was the daughter of a prominent democratic leader. Aristocrat though he was, Cæsar relied on the votes of the proletarians and the knights rather than on friends in the Senate. In order to curry favor with the populace, he had spent a large fortune on lavish public entertainments and festivals — a fortune which he borrowed from the wealthy Crassus. Cæsar was not yet strong enough to stand alone, but, thanks to his friendly relations with the two older men, Cæsar was able to bring them together in a sort of alliance, with himself as junior partner. He also tried to conciliate Cicero, but without success.

The First Triumvirate. — The partnership of Pompey, Crassus, and Cæsar was known as the Triumvirate (trī-ŭm′vĭ-răt, meaning "the three men"). In this coalition Pompey was essentially the military hero, Crassus the wealthy capitalist, and Cæsar the astute politician. The partners managed to secure the election of Cæsar as one of the two consuls for the year 59 B.C. In return, Cæsar successfully engineered the passage of bills bestowing cer-

[1] See pp. 305–306.

tain public lands upon Pompey's veterans, ratifying Pompey's acts in Asia, and reducing by a third the amount which the publican friends of Crassus had to pay the treasury for their Asiatic tax contracts. For himself, Cæsar obtained the governorship of Illyricum and Gaul, with command of four legions, for five years (59–54 B.C.). This provincial governorship was to Cæsar a stepping stone toward greater power. It enabled him to become conqueror of Gaul [1] and to return with the two things an ambitious politician needed — a veteran army and great wealth, the latter for use in paying soldiers and bribing voters.

Break-up of the Triumvirate. — While Cæsar was conquering Gaul (58–51 B.C.), Crassus attempted to conquer part of Persia but was captured and killed; the Persians with sardonic cruelty poured molten gold down the millionaire's throat. Pompey, meanwhile, remained at Rome in command of the Italian army and the Mediterranean fleet. Increasingly Pompey depended on the Senate for support, especially after the death of his wife Julia, Cæsar's sister. Gradually Pompey and Cæsar drifted from partnership to rivalry. When Pompey, now sole consul, endeavored to have Cæsar deprived of command in Gaul, rivalry became enmity.

Cæsar Crosses the Rubicon. — When the Senate, with Pompey's assent, called on Cæsar to surrender his provinces and disband his army, the conqueror of Gaul knew that the crisis had come. If he obeyed, he would doubtless be brought to trial on some charge or other, and his career would end. If he disobeyed, he would plunge the country into a bloody civil war. Standing with his army on the bank of the Rubicon River, the border line between Italy and the province in which he was master, he hesitated, then decided to cross over, although it was illegal to lead his provincial army outside his provinces. "The dice are cast," he exclaimed.

Let us remember that it was as a provincial governor with an army fresh from conquering Gaul that Julius Cæsar crossed the Rubicon. The Roman Republic had been weakened by internal strife between rich and poor, between Senate and Assembly, between senatorial aristocrats, knightly capitalists, and turbulent

[1] See pp. 297–299.

proletarians. But the thing that destroyed the republic in the end was the ambition of men who as military leaders had in their hands the power of professional armies — armies that had grown out of Rome's wars of conquest.

The Dictatorship of Julius Cæsar

Cæsar Supreme. — When he crossed the Rubicon, January 7, 49 B.C., Julius Cæsar found himself master of Rome and of Italy, for Pompey fled to the East and the Senate dared not resist the veterans of Gaul. In the following years Pompey was defeated at Pharsalus (fär-sā'lŭs), in Thessaly, whence he fled to Egypt, only to be murdered there. Though several mutinies and rebellions remained to be suppressed during the next few years, Cæsar was the supreme figure in the Mediterranean world from 48 to 44 B.C.

Julius Cæsar

Significance of Cæsar. — "Cæsarism" is defined in modern dictionaries as a form of imperialism or of autocracy. That is to say, it means the rule of one man over an empire. Few men have left a more vivid impression on the imagination of later ages than Cæsar. In prose, in verse, in drama, the story has been told and retold of his usurpation of power, of his rejection of the crown, of his assassination. He was the link between republic and monarchy. His position resembled that of earlier political bosses and military dictators such as the Gracchi, Marius, Sulla, and Pompey, but his power was more complete and more frankly recognized. On the other hand, we can find in Cæsar's dictatorship

many of the methods, policies, and forms characteristic of the Roman Emperors. To make a sharp dividing line between the republic and the monarchy is impossible, for the republic continued to exist in name and in form during Cæsar's lifetime and long afterwards, while in fact Rome was under one-man rule.

His Powers and Titles. — While gathering all real power into his own hands, Julius Cæsar was careful to preserve the traditional institutions of the republic. The Senate continued to sit, but its membership was enlarged (to 900) to include many of Cæsar's veterans and friends; its control over foreign affairs and over the administration of the provinces was largely transferred to him; and its chief remaining functions were to flatter the great man with new titles and honors and to obey his imperious will. There were still two consuls, but Cæsar was one of them. There were still tribunes, but their chief powers were vested in Cæsar. The number of treasurers (quæstors) and assistant consuls (prætors) was doubled, but they were Cæsar's loyal followers. Cæsar himself had power to declare war, make peace, command the army, control the treasury, and appoint officials. Yet he was not king in name. The title *Imperator* which he stamped on his coins meant only General or Commander, and was regularly bestowed on victorious military leaders; it had not yet come to mean Emperor in our modern sense. The title and office of *Dictator*, conferred on Cæsar for life, had often been given to prominent men in the past, in time of crisis, though not permanently. Another title, of which Cæsar seems to have been particularly proud, was "Father of his Country" (*Pater Patriæ*).

Sources of His Power. — Looking beneath these titles and forms, we see the real sources of Cæsar's despotic power. First, he had a large army of veteran troops who were loyal to him personally, rather than to the constitution or the republic. Second, as an exceedingly clever politician, from the very beginning of his career Cæsar had made himself a representative of the common people and won the loyalty of the proletariat by advocating their interests and by spending money freely to provide popular festivals, gladiatorial shows, and athletic contests. Third, Cæsar obtained immense sums, equivalent to many millions of dollars, from con-

quered cities, and used his wealth freely not only to pay his soldiers but also to bribe voters and politicians. Fourth, as supreme political boss — if we may call him that — he had power to reward his followers with public offices. Perhaps these reasons will explain why the Senate usually seemed eager to heap honors upon him, and to gratify his every wish, and why the proletarian Assembly and its tribunes, so troublesome to men like Marius, Sulla, and Pompey, accepted Cæsar as dictator.

Campaigns and Plans. — It is not easy to say what Cæsar would have accomplished had he lived to carry out his plans. He enjoyed supreme power only five years, and of that brief period he spent only a few months in Rome. The rest of his time was spent crushing enemies and rebels in Spain, in Thessaly, in Egypt, in Asia Minor, in Italy, in Africa, and again in Spain. Just before his death, he was preparing an army of 100,000 men to conquer Mesopotamia and Persia. Perhaps Cæsar, like Alexander, would have attempted the conquest of India, had he lived.

Cæsar's Reforms. — Busy as he was with military campaigns, Cæsar nevertheless found time to accomplish several noteworthy reforms. (1) His reorganization of the central government has already been described. (2) His Municipal Law standardized the local municipal governments of the cities throughout Italy. (3) In the province of Asia, he substituted regular taxes for the unlimited exactions of the publicans. As he pursued the same policy in Gaul, we may perhaps assume that he aimed to end the scandalous exploitation of subject peoples by Roman tax-collectors. (4) His attitude toward the Empire was shown also by his granting of Roman citizenship to a number of cities in conquered provinces such as Gaul and Spain; by his grant of the status of Latin allies to other cities, as a preliminary step toward full citizenship; by his appointment of individual Gauls and other non-Italians to the Senate; by his enlistment of non-Italians in the legions. Such acts contributed to the unification and Romanization of the Empire. (5) By sending out from Rome many thousands of his army veterans and of Roman proletarians to found colonies in Italy and in the provinces, notably on the sites of Corinth and Carthage, he not only strengthened the unity of the Empire but also eased the

political and economic situation at home. The colonies drained off the landless, discontented elements. (6) The fact that Cæsar reduced the number of persons to whom free grain was distributed by the state from 320,000 to 150,000, and that he dissolved the troublesome proletarian political clubs in Rome, should be mentioned in this connection. The safety-valve of colonization made such measures possible. (7) The most lasting of Cæsar's reforms was the adoption of a new calendar. The old Roman calendar based on a year of 355 days was complicated and inaccurate. With the help of a Greek astronomer, Cæsar revised the calendar so that it would have 365 days in the year, with an extra day every fourth year. The odd-numbered months were to have thirty-one days, the even months thirty, excepting February, which had only twenty-nine. One of the months, July, was so named in Cæsar's honor. The Julian calendar is still observed, with some modifications, by the entire world.[1]

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

THE HEAD OF AN EGYPTIAN MUMMY

Side view. Dates from the period of Roman rule in Egypt. The paintings on the side show that the native Egyptian culture and religion survived foreign conquest and continued to influence the lives and thoughts of Egyptians.

Other reforms Cæsar had time only to plan. He intended to

[1] Cæsar's successor, Augustus, gave the eighth month his own name. As July had thirty-one days, August likewise had to be given the same number, rather than thirty. The extra day was taken from February. To avoid having three successive months with thirty-one days, Augustus reduced September and November to thirty, and increased October and December to thirty-one. Thus the simple rule that months of thirty and thirty-one days should alternate was discarded to gratify the pride of a Roman Emperor.

have a simple code of laws compiled, to take the place of the confusing mass of statutes. He planned to establish a great public library, to drain the malarial swamps in Italy, to construct canals, to beautify Rome.

Monarchism. — There was a good deal of fear that Julius Cæsar was aiming to make himself king. Not content with supreme power as a dictator for life, he seems to have desired to transform his dictatorship into an avowed monarchy. When he placed his own statue alongside the figures of the seven ancient kings of Rome, and when he adopted for his own use the golden throne, the ivory scepter, and the purple embroidered robe of the former kings, Roman republicans took alarm. Moreover, Cæsar ordered statues of himself to be set up in the temples of the whole Empire. His private mansion had a pediment, as temples did, to show that it was the dwelling-place of a god. The order was issued that Cæsar must be worshipped as a divine being. All this smacks of oriental despotism. We are reminded of the Pharaohs, Egypt's god-kings, and of Alexander's claim that he was a god.

FRONT VIEW OF THE SAME EGYPTIAN MUMMY

Cleopatra and Cæsar's Ambitions. — Cæsar was well acquainted with the oriental practice of king-worship. He had spent several months in Egypt, where he had helped the Princess Cleopatra wrest the throne from her brother. It is said that the charms of this young Egyptian[1] girl-queen fascinated the Roman general, that

[1] Of course, she was Macedonian by ancestry, but Egyptian by birth.

he brought her to his villa at Rome, and that he put her statue in the temple of Venus. It was rumored that he intended to make himself king, with Cleopatra as his queen, and with some city in the Near East as his capital.

Assassination of Cæsar. — Though he declined to accept the crown when it was offered to him by Mark Antony, Cæsar decided to assume the title of king in the provinces. He would be king except in Italy, and there his position as dictator and god would ensure almost royal power. The fear that Rome would lose her proud preëminence and become merely a provincial city subject to an oriental despot must have been a factor in the conspiracy against the dictator. On the Ides of March in the year 44 B.C., the very day that the Senate was to discuss the bill making him king outside Italy, Cæsar was attacked in the Senate chamber by a band of senators under the leadership of Caius Cassius and Marcus Junius Brutus. Stabbed to death by the daggers of men who had formerly been his friends, the dictator fell at the foot of Pompey's statue. Like Pompey, he had been an uncrowned monarch of Rome. Even more than Pompey, he had helped prepare the way for genuine monarchy.

The Imperial Monarchy of Augustus

Although they had stabbed Cæsar, the assassins soon discovered that they had not killed his popularity. Nor had they altered the situation that had produced a Cæsar. Neither the daggers of Cassius and Brutus, nor the orations of Cicero, could change that situation.

Mark Antony. — Among the aspirants for supreme power, the most prominent at first was Mark Antony, who had served Cæsar in Gaul and had been given the high office of consul during Cæsar's dictatorship. Antony reminded the people of Cæsar's achievements, aroused Cæsar's veterans against the assassins, and published Cæsar's will, which bequeathed the latter's beautiful gardens to Rome as a public park and promised fifteen dollars to every Roman citizen. By such methods Antony not only revived Cæsar's popularity, but used it to make himself the most influential man

in Rome. He was attempting to step into the dead man's shoes.

Octavian. — But there was a rival candidate. In his will, Julius Cæsar had named his sister's grandson, Octavius, as his adopted son and as heir to the bulk of his immense fortune. Because Octavius was only eighteen years old at the time, with no army or political following, Antony disregarded him. Octavius, however, boldly took the legacy, came to Rome, and assumed the name Caius Julius Cæsar Octavianus. By making himself an ally of the republican party in the Senate against Antony, he obtained appointment as a general and thus secured an army. Cicero thought Octavian (ŏk-tā′vĭ-ȧn, as we may now call Octavius) could be used and then "set aside." But, taking a leaf from his namesake's book, Octavian led his army into Rome and compelled Senate and Assembly to give him the office of consul.



MARK ANTONY

Second Triumvirate. — Still following Cæsar's example, Octavian now joined his rival in a Triumvirate (43–36 B.C.), a three-man dictatorship, consisting of Antony, Octavian, and Lepidus (lĕp′ĭ-dŭs, Cæsar's former cavalry commander). Each of the three men was to enjoy consular power for five years. The purpose of Octavian in joining the Triumvirate was to gain Antony's aid in

overthrowing the republican party in the Senate and defeating the republican armies (led by Brutus and Cassius) in the eastern provinces. By proscriptions, executions, and murders, the Triumvirate thoroughly cowed the Senate. About three hundred senators were slain; Cicero's tongue was forever silenced in death; former enemies of Cæsar and present enemies of the Triumvirs were ruthlessly exterminated; and the estates of these enemies, several thousands of them, were divided among the Triumvirs and their soldiers. As for the republican armies of Brutus and Cassius, the famous battle of Philippi (fĭ-lĭp′ī), fought in the year 42 B.C., was decisive. Their combined force of eighty thousand men was defeated by the Triumvirs, and the two ex-conspirators committed suicide. The three victors divided the administration of the Empire, Antony taking the largest share (Gaul and the eastern provinces), while Lepidus received Africa, and Octavian had Spain and Italy. Before many years had passed, however, Lepidus resigned and Octavian took over Africa and Gaul and became master of the entire West.

Antony and Cleopatra. — Meanwhile, Antony established himself in the East, tried to conquer Persia, and was conquered by Cleopatra. The pretty girl who had once won Cæsar's heart was now a young woman of twenty-eight years, still Queen of Egypt, clever, and charming enough to captivate a Roman general. Antony fell desperately in love, married her, and ordered his wife Octavia (sister of Octavian) to stay in Italy. By so doing, Antony broke not only with Octavian but also with Rome. Under Cleopatra's influence and cloudless Egyptian skies he dreamed of making himself an oriental despot. He proclaimed her "Queen of Queens"; his sons he made kings of Armenia and Syria; he himself would be another Alexander, and, like Alexander, would conquer Persia. It was when he demanded troops for his Persian campaign from Octavian, and was refused, that he prepared to attack Italy with 100,000 men and 500 ships.

Octavian's Triumph. — For Octavian, this was doubtless a welcome opportunity to dispose of his one remaining rival. For Rome it was a threat to substitute oriental despotism for the republic, and to transfer the government from Italy to the East.

Octavian made this menace seem the more real by publishing Antony's will, and accusing him of planning to make himself king. The Senate voted to deprive Antony of his consular authority and declared war on Cleopatra. And in a great naval battle at Actium (ăk′shĭ-ŭm), 31 B.C., the West met the East. In the midst of the conflict Cleopatra treacherously withdrew the Egyptian fleet and sailed for Egypt. Her infatuated lover followed, leaving his fleet to be destroyed and his army to be captured. In the end, he committed suicide, rather than be captured, and Cleopatra, finding Octavian sternly untouched by her charms, took her own life. That left Octavian free to take possession of Egypt and restore the Roman order in the East. When, in the year



"CLEOPATRA'S NEEDLE"

This obelisk, cut from red granite quarried near the first cataract of the Nile, was set up in the year 1465 B.C. to celebrate the third jubilee of Thutmose III (see page 62). From its ancient position in front of the Temple of the Sun at Heliopolis, it was moved by the Romans to Alexandria, 13–12 B.C., and set up before the Temple of the Cæsars there. It was brought to New York in 1880 and now stands in Central Park near the Metropolitan Museum of Art.

29 B.C., Octavian celebrated his triumph at Rome, at the age of thirty-three, he was, as he said, "master of all things." Both in name and in fact, he was a second Cæsar.

Masked Autocracy. — That his reign lasted forty-three years (from 29 B.C. to 14 A.D.) instead of four, and that it ended with his peaceful death at a ripe old age rather than with assassination, was largely because this second Cæsar understood more clearly that his monarchy must be masked. The fact of autocracy must be veiled under republican institutions. Like Julius Cæsar, Octavian held the offices of consul and high priest, and the authority of a tribune and the titles *Imperator* and *Pater Patriæ;* but he wisely refused to have his term as consul extended for life, or to accept the title of dictator. He did accept the new title of *Augustus* ("Majestic"). He also allowed himself to be called *Princeps* (from which word comes the modern term "prince"), but that meant only "First Citizen" (*Princeps civium Romanorum*). Refusing pomp and ceremony, he lived like a senatorial nobleman, rather than like an oriental despot. The Senate and the people were reassured: this Cæsar would neither accept a kingly crown nor transfer the capital to the East. The

OCTAVIAN (AUGUSTUS CÆSAR)

Roman republic would be preserved in name and outward form if not in fact.

In fact the ruler personally had supreme control of foreign relations, of war and peace, and of the all-important business of supplying the city with grain. His most vital powers, especially the command of the legions and authority over the provinces, were conferred for five or ten years at a time, but were continued without question throughout his life. His supremacy depended on no single office or title; it consisted in the sum total of his various offices, and it was based securely on his popularity, his sagacity, his control of the army, and his personal wealth. The last-mentioned had been acquired largely as the result of his victories and his confiscation of the estates of enemies. It enabled him to increase his popularity by constructing and repairing temples, public buildings, aqueducts, streets and highways at his own expense.

Assembly and Senate. — The old republican institutions were preserved, but with lessened powers. The Assembly's chief functions were to vote to the Princeps the authority of tribune, to elect officials nominated by him, and to approve measures proposed by him. The Senate remained a very dignified body and theoretically had charge of finance and administration in Italy and the more peaceful provinces, such as Sicily, Asia, and Macedonia. The men who wore the broad senatorial stripe of purple on their white togas were mostly aristocrats of birth and wealth who had served in minor public offices before admission into the Senate. The important proconsuls (provincial governors) and the generals in the army were senators, as were the members of the chief administrative boards. The experience, wealth, and influence of its members kept the Senate from becoming a nonentity. But it was loyal to Octavian and accepted his control. He had power to convene it, to introduce the first business at each session, and to veto any measure at any stage. Many of the senators were his personal friends, appointed by him to fill the gaps left by the proscriptions and civil wars of 44–30 B.C.

Peace. — The new ruler, whom we may now call by his title of Augustus, brought peace to Rome. The people were weary of war, especially of civil war. Great was the popular rejoicing when the

doors of the Temple of Janus were closed in the year 29 B.C., for the first time in two centuries. A splendid sculptured altar was erected in the parade ground (Campus Martius) in honor of the "Peace of Augustus."

The Army. — The danger from foreign enemies and barbarians was met by maintaining a strong army. Augustus kept twenty-five Roman legions (150,000 men) and an equal number of non-Roman or provincial troops under arms, ready to defend the Empire. No

SCULPTURE ON THE AUGUSTAN ALTAR OF PEACE OR PLENTY

longer could Roman Italy provide easily the forces required to hold the Empire. The army ceased to be a militia of Roman citizens. It became definitely a professional body, recruited to a large extent in the most Romanized provinces. The enlisted men served for a long term and were attracted by good pay, land grants, bonuses, and Roman citizenship. Italian control was guaranteed by the fact that the higher army officers were Roman senators and knights. The Prætorian (prē-tō′rĭ-ăn) Guard, a crack division of nine thousand picked men stationed at Rome, was composed of Italians and served as a sort of officers' training corps.

Prevention of Civil War. — Augustus also had to guard against civil war. In the past the trouble had been that a successful general such as Marius, Sulla, Pompey, Julius Cæsar, or Mark Antony could use his army to help himself seize power. To prevent such military dictators from arising in the future, Augustus made himself commander-in-chief of the army and distributed most of it along the frontiers. He had not only military command but governmental control over the provinces in which there was any need of large forces — namely, Spain, Gaul, and Syria. Egypt he kept as a personal possession. When trouble arose in other provinces, such as Illyria or Cilicia, he took charge of them.

Natural Frontiers. — Although his policy was essentially directed toward lasting peace, or perhaps because of this fact, Augustus added several new provinces by conquest, chiefly for the purpose of rounding out the Empire to easily defensible frontiers such as oceans and large rivers. He left the Empire with the Danube and the Rhine as its frontiers on the north; the Black Sea, the Euphrates River, and the Arabian Desert, on the east; the Sahara, on the south; and the Atlantic Ocean, on the west.

Prosperity. — While a few legions might be engaged, from time to time, in border wars, the circle of civilized lands around the Mediterranean enjoyed peace such as it had never known. And peace meant prosperity and culture. The well-policed Mediterranean was a Roman lake, across which thousands of sailing vessels carried wheat, wine, olive oil, linen, woollens, dishes, and metalware in a flourishing commerce. The knights or bourgeois capitalists were strong supporters of the government. As the ruins at Pompeii (pŏm-pā′yē) and many another ancient city show, this was an age of wealth, an age in which capitalists were building splendid mansions, and in which cities were being adorned with beautiful public buildings. When Augustus boasted that he found Rome a city of bricks and left it a city of marble he doubtless exaggerated his achievement and ignored the tenements in which the masses lived, but as regards the temples and public buildings his statement may have been near the truth.

Golden Age of Literature. — In literature, too, this was the "Golden Age." Virgil (vûr′jĭl) was writing his great epic, the

"Æneid," describing the wanderings of Æneas after the fall of Troy, as Homer in the "Odyssey" had traced the travels of Odysseus. It may be remarked that Virgil's work was in form a Latin imitation of the Greek epic, and in content an elaboration of the myth the Greeks had invented to connect Rome with the Ægean world. It was also a glorification of Rome and of her ruler, whose family claimed descent from Æneas. Another poet of the Augustan age, Horace, was composing his lyrics—the "Odes." Ovid (ŏv′ĭd), when he was not singing of his own amours, was putting love affairs and other deeds of the gods, according to Greek and Latin mythology, into polished verses. Livy (lĭv′ĭ) was publishing instalments of his lengthy and rhetorical history of Rome. Other authors were writing books on Stoic and Epicurean philosophy, on rhetoric, on architecture, and on a dozen other subjects. The tutor employed by the imperial family compiled an encyclopedia. Mæcenas (mē-sē′năs), famed as the most generous patron of poets, was one of the most influential of the Emperor's friends.

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

VIRGIL

Culture in the Provinces. — Besides the artists and authors who basked in the sunshine of the Emperor's patronage at Rome, and who celebrated his greatness in verse, in prose, or in marble, there were thousands in provincial cities, especially in the Hellenistic East, who were contributing to Augustan civilization. The greatest geographer of the age was Strabo, a native of Asia Minor, who spent years of study in Alexandria. Athens still attracted students from Rome.

Religion. — Not the least significant feature of the period was its religious aspect. The ancient Roman gods had become, by this time, quite thoroughly identified with the gods of Greek mythology,[1] but at the same time they inspired less reverence than of old. Forgetting their own Lares and Penates, their Jupiter and Mars, many Romans of the upper classes had either turned to Hellenistic philosophies such as Stoicism and Epicureanism,[2] or devoted themselves to cynical enjoyment of material pleasures. Frivolity and immorality were rampant in Roman society. Hoping to restore the old Roman piety, Augustus repaired scores of neglected temples, but temples do not make religion. Hoping to restore morality and family life, he passed various laws giving special privileges to men who married and had families. He banished the poet Ovid for his licentious writings. He even banished his own daughter because of her scandalous love affairs. On the whole, however, his efforts availed little. The old gods and the old virtues were dying, and their place was being taken by new philosophies and new religions.

It was in the reign of Augustus that Jesus was born in a stable at Bethlehem. But of Christianity and other religious developments we shall have to treat in a later chapter.[3]

[1] The chief gods were as follows, the Roman names being given first and the Greek names in parentheses: — Jupiter (Zeus), the sky god; Juno (Hera), his wife, the protectress of marriage; Mars (Ares), originally the god of spring vegetation, but later of war; Venus (Aphrodite), the goddess of love and beauty; Mercury (Hermes), the messenger of the gods and the patron of business and commerce; Ceres (Demeter), the goddess of agriculture and fertility; Neptune (Poseidon), the god of the sea; Diana (Artemis), goddess of the moon and huntress; Vulcan (Hephæstus), god of fire and of metal-forging; Vesta (Hestia), goddess of the hearth and the home. Saturn, an ancient Italian god of grain-sowing and agriculture, was identified with the Greek Cronos, father of Zeus; Apollo, the Greek sun-god, patron of youth, poetry, music, medicine, and agriculture, was also adopted by the Romans, as was Pluto, the dread ruler of the underworld. Janus, an ancient Latin sky-god, the god of beginnings and endings, became less important and was thought of as the gatekeeper of the heavens and the protector of doorways. Ideas concerning these gods went through many changes and were so confusing that modern authorities disagree about them. The worship of these gods was the central part of Græco-Roman Paganism.

[2] See pp. 239–240. [3] Chapter XIII.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Describe the growth of capitalism in Rome during the period of the wars of conquest. What were the political effects of the growth of capitalism? What prominent politicians were closely identified with the bourgeois capitalists?

2. Why did the Roman peasantry decline? What effects did the decline of the peasantry have on the army and on politics?

3. Discuss the causes and the effects of the growth of slavery in the Roman Republic.

4. What was meant by the proletariat? Can you mention any eminent Roman politicians who catered to the desires of the proletariat?

5. What did Tiberius and Caius Gracchus attempt to accomplish? Why did they fail?

6. Explain how Marius and Sulla showed the importance of military power as a basis for a political dictatorship.

7. Trace the steps by which Julius Cæsar won supreme power in the Roman Republic.

8. Under Julius Cæsar was Rome a republic or a monarchy? Give detailed reasons for your answer.

9. What reforms did Cæsar enact?

10. Explain the circumstances that led to the formation of the Second Triumvirate. Compare it with the First Triumvirate.

11. Trace the steps by which Octavian became Princeps, and explain how he reconciled the forms of republican government with the reality of monarchy. Compare his position with that of Pericles and with that of the Persian Emperor Darius.

12. Discuss the military policy of Augustus.

13. Why is the reign of Augustus often referred to as a "Golden Age"?

14. Can you see any reasons why the monarchy of Augustus might have difficulty in maintaining itself after his death?

SPECIAL TOPICS

Business life in the age of Cicero. FOWLER, *Social Life at Rome in the Age of Cicero*, 60–96; ROSTOVTZEFF, *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, ch. i.

The Roman constitution in the 2nd century B.C. FRANK, *History of Rome*, 180–193.

Roman society in the age of Cicero and Cæsar. FOWLER, *Social Life*, 263–284; FRANK, *History of Rome*, 314–331.

The working classes. FOWLER, *Social Life*, 24–59.

Roman slavery. DAVIS, *Influence of Wealth in Imperial Rome*, 205–217; FOWLER, *Social Life*, 204–236; SANDYS, *Companion to Latin Studies*, 362–365; MUNRO, *Source Book of Roman History*, 179–192.

Cicero. PLUTARCH, *Lives* (Cicero); ROLFE, *Cicero;* DUFF, *Literary History of Rome*, 349–398.

The Gracchi. BOAK, *History of Rome*, 125–131; FRANK, *History of Rome*, 194–210; PLUTARCH, *Lives* (Tiberius and Caius Gracchus).

Marius. FRANK, *History of Rome*, 211–236; PLUTARCH, *Lives* (Marius).

Sulla. FRANK, *History of Rome*, 236–247; PLUTARCH, *Lives* (Sulla).

Julius Cæsar. FOWLER, *Julius Cæsar*, ch. xviii; FRANK, *History of Rome*, 293–313; PLUTARCH, *Lives* (Julius Cæsar).

Augustus. FOWLER, *Rome*, 187–211; BOTSFORD, *Source-Book of Ancient History*, 454–457, 464–474; GREENIDGE, *Roman Public Life*, ch. x.

Hellenism and Rome. MAHAFFY, *Alexander's Empire*, 300–310; DUFF, *Literary History of Rome*, ch. ii; DE BURGH, *Legacy of the Ancient World*, 207–211.

Business life in the Augustan Age. FRANK, *History of Rome*, 375–405; ROSTOVTZEFF, *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, ch. ii.

Gladiatorial shows and public amusements. FRIEDLÄNDER, *Roman Life and Manners*, II, 41–62; MUNRO, *Source Book of Roman History*, 209–213.

Education. FOWLER, *Social Life*, 168–203; SANDYS, *Companion to Latin Studies*, 226–236.

The city of Rome. FRIEDLÄNDER, *Roman Life and Manners*, I, 1–29.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THE TEACHER

A. E. R. BOAK, *History of Rome.* T. FRANK, *History of Rome.* T. FRANK, *Economic History of Rome.* M. ROSTOVTZEFF, *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, chs. i–ii. T. MOMMSEN, *History of Rome.* J. B. BURY, *History of the Roman Empire.* W. W. FOWLER, *Social Life at Rome in the Age of Cicero.* A. H. J. GREENIDGE, *Roman Public Life.* W. W. FOWLER, *Julius Cæsar.* J. B. FIRTH, *Augustus Cæsar.* W. S. DAVIS, *A Day in Old Rome.* W. B. MCDANIEL, *Roman Private Life.* F. F. ABBOTT, *Common People of Ancient Rome.* W. E. HEITLAND, *Agricola, a Study of Agricultural and Rustic Life in the Greco-Roman World.* PAUL-LOUIS, *Ancient Rome at Work.* A. GRENIER, *The Roman Spirit.* T. R. GLOVER, *Democracy in the Ancient World*, chs. vii–ix. See also Chapter IX.

CONVENIENT SOURCE MATERIALS

G. W. BOTSFORD, *Source-Book of Ancient History*, 379–479. D. C. MUNRO, *Source Book of Roman History*, chs. vii–ix. W. S. DAVIS, *Readings in Ancient History*, II. PLUTARCH, *Lives* (Tiberius Gracchus, Caius Gracchus, Sulla, Crassus, Pompey, Marius, Cicero, Brutus, Cæsar).

CHAPTER XI

THE ROMAN EMPIRE AND GRÆCO-ROMAN CIVILIZATION

The Successors of Augustus

Hereditary Monarchy. — Careful as Augustus was to respect the old customs of the Roman Republic, what he left to his successors was practically a hereditary monarchy without the title or crown of royalty. Usually it is termed an Empire, and Augustus an Emperor. It has also been called the Principate, because the ruler was generally known as the "Princeps." Usually he was also entitled "Augustus," "Father of his Country," "Imperator," "High Priest," and sometimes "Cæsar." Theoretically the Emperor was elected to his various offices by Senate and Assembly. In practice, each Emperor chose his own heir and adopted him as a son. The heir was always a member of the family. This was the rule until 68 A.D. Thus the Augustan monarchy was continued through the reigns of Tiberius (14–37 A.D.), Caius Cæsar (37–41 A.D.), Claudius (41–54 A.D.), and Nero (54–68 A.D.). Including Augustus himself, the dynasty lasted a century, lacking three years.

The Imperial Government. — The successors of Augustus were less careful about disguising their autocracy. They secured election for life, rather than for a few years at a time. The Assembly ceased to have any real powers of legislation or election. The Senate continued to vote for officials nominated by the Emperor and for laws proposed by him, but its control over the government became less and less real, and its dignity was no longer respected.

The three most vital departments of government concentrated in the Emperor's hands were the army, imperial finance, and

ATLANTIC OCEAN
NORTH SEA
BALTIC SEA
IRELAND
Firth of Forth
Hadrian's Wall
Solway Firth
York
BRITAIN
London
English Channel
BAY OF BISCAY
GERMANY
Saxons
Elbe R.
Sueves
Vandals
Oder R.
Vistula
Alemans
Burgundians
Franks
Teutoburg Forest
CHATTI
Cologne
Trier
BELGICA
LUGDUNENSIS
Seine R.
Loire
GAUL
AQUITANIA
Lyons
Rhone R.
Vindelicia
RÆTIA
NORICUM
Danube R.
PANNONIA
Como
Milan
Verona
Aquileia
Pollentia
Po R.
Ravenna
Pisa
ITALY
Sirmium
DALMATIA
Salonæ
ADRIATIC SEA
GALLÆCIA AND ASTURIA
Duero R.
SPAIN
Ebro R.
Pyrenees
Tolosa
NARBONENSIS
Narbo
Marseilles
TARRACONENSIS
LUSITANIA
Tagus R.
(HITHER)
Cordova
BÆTICA
Cadiz
CORSICA
SARDINIA
BALEARIC IS.
Rome
Ostia
CAMPANIA
Herculaneum
Vesuvius Mt.
Pompeii
Brundisium
CAPRI
Messana
CORCYRA
MEDITERRANEAN
New Carthage
MAURETANIA
Utica
Agrigentum
SICILY
Rhegium
Syracuse
Carthage
Cirta
NUMIDIA
EARLIER PROV. AFRICA
Thapsus
Syrtis Minor
AFRICA
LATER PROV. AFRICA
Leptis
Berenice
Syrtis Major
Scale of miles
0 100 200 300 400 500 600
Boundary at Death of Augustus; beyond this the later additions
Italics-- Barbarian races which, after Marcus Aurelius, appear in the places indicated
Longitude West
Longitude
East

THE ROMAN

SARMATIA
Huns
Slavs
Goths
Alans
Carpathian Mts.
CASPIAN SEA
DACIA
Sarmizegetusa
Danube R.
MOESIA
BLACK SEA
Caucasus Mts.
Trapezus
Artaxata
Araxes R.
ARMENIA
DARDANIA
Philippi
THRACE
Adrianople
Byzantium (Constantinople)
Nicomedia
Sinope
PONTUS
CAPPADOCIA PONTICA
BITHYNIA
GALATIA
Nicæa
Cæsarea
CAPPADOCIA
MACEDONIA
Salonica
GREECE
EPIRUS
Athens
ACHAIA
Sparta
LESBOS
CHIOS
SAMOS
Egean Sea
Pergamum
Ancyra
ASIA
Sardis
Smyrna
LYCAONIA
PISIDIA
LYCIA
PAMPHYLIA
CILICIA
Tarsus
Antioch
Edessa
MESOPOTAMIA
Tigris R.
PARTHIAN EMPIRE
Ctesiphon
Euphrates R.
Seleucia
SYRIA
Palmyra
Damascus
Salamis
RHODES
CYPRUS
CRETE
Tyre
Cæsarea
JUDÆA
Jerusalem
ARABIA PETRÆA
ARABIA
Alexandria
Cyrene
CYRENAICA
Amon
Memphis
EGYPT
Nile R.
RED SEA
Thebes
Syene
Wms. Eng. Co., N.Y.
from Greenwich

EMPIRE

public works. It was the Emperor who controlled the army and kept it in good humor, if he could, by liberal wages and bonuses. The Emperor's financial officials (procurators) supervised tax-collection not only in the provinces directly under his administration but also in the provinces supposedly under the Senate's rule. Besides collecting taxes in the provinces, the Emperor had the income of his own enormous estate, consisting of lands, forests, mines, workshops, and fisheries. Every war meant booty added to his estate; confiscation of the property of traitors and suspected traitors meant still further additions; and many a rich man prudently willed part of his property to the Emperor, lest the latter should be displeased and confiscate the whole. Moreover, in the rich province of Egypt the Emperor was not merely governor, but successor of the Pharaohs and Ptolemies, and, like them, owner of most of the soil and much of the industry of the country. He was a millionaire many times over.

Panem et Circenses. — The Emperor's income was used in part for the luxuries of the imperial household, but it was also used to feed and amuse the city of Rome, to purchase the army's loyalty, and to construct public works. Grain from Egypt was distributed free to the Roman proletariat. Roman holidays were celebrated by parades, dramatic performances in the theater, chariot races in the circus, gladiatorial combats and battles between gladiators and wild beasts in the arena, with all Rome applauding on the benches. It should never be forgotten that such exhibitions were the most important means of purchasing loyalty and popularity. *Panem et circenses* ("bread and circuses") the Roman populace demanded and received. The people were so hardened to bloodshed that their favorite holiday amusement was to watch hundreds of gladiators killing each other, or fighting panthers and lions.

Public Works and Palaces. — The Emperors were lavish in their expenditures on public works as well as on public amusements. They built splendid stone-paved roads and streets; they erected marble temples and forums not only at Rome but in provincial cities; they brought an increased water supply to Rome through new stone aqueducts. When a large part of the city was swept by the great fire of 64 A.D., the Emperor Nero rebuilt it with straight,

wide streets, and replaced the old wooden tenements with better houses partly of stone. But a large part of the fire-stricken area he converted into a great park, in which he erected his celebrated "Golden House" — a huge stone and marble palace, with mosaic floors and frescoed walls, with statues and carving, and with a colonnade three miles long. At one of its porticos Nero set up a colossal bronze statue of himself, a hundred and twenty feet high.

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

GLADIATORS IN THE COLOSSEUM
As depicted by a modern artist.

One is reminded of the ninety-foot statues of ancient Egyptian Pharaohs. Nero was outdoing the ancient despots of Egypt.

Emperor Worship. — Whereas Augustus had endeavored to live without too much splendor, pretending to be only the greatest of Roman nobles, his successors assumed a loftier air and surrounded themselves with the luxury, pomp, and ceremony of eastern kings. More than that, two of them, Caius (Caligula) and Nero, adopted the Egyptian practice of insisting on worship of themselves as gods. Nero had a crown with rays of gold, symbolical of his position as

the representative of the sun-god. Not that he really thought himself a god. But if he could make the people regard him as divine, his despotism would not be considered a violation of the old constitution, and his throne would be more secure against envious rivals. He knew that in eastern lands Emperor-worship had helped dynasties to hold their thrones for centuries. Egypt and the eastern provinces willingly built altars to the Emperor-God, but Rome took less kindly to the new worship.

Insecurity and Terrorism. — In spite of their pomp and pretensions, the four Emperors who followed Augustus were in reality very uncertain of their throne and even of their lives. Though the Senate submitted to them, and even flattered them, many a proud senator of ancient lineage envied and hated the First Citizen. The Assembly might be ignored, but the populace had to be fed and amused, lest it rebel. To overawe senators and populace, one had to rely on the Prætorian Guard. It was to the soldiers of the Guard that each new Emperor first presented himself for approval. But what if the Guard should betray him? That was the fear that haunted the Emperors. That was why, from the death of Augustus to the suicide of Nero, the Emperors had every possible rival, every suspected conspirator, executed or murdered. Incidentally, the confiscated estates of suspects helped pay the bills for imperial extravagances. Moreover, as the person who denounced a conspirator received a percentage of the condemned man's property, many men found it profitable to become spies and informers. As a result, executions became so numerous that the aristocracy lived under a shadow of terror. Doubtless the spirit of uncertainty and mistrust that prevailed in the court at Rome had something to do with the reckless dissipation, the debauches and orgies for which Roman high society became famous at this period. Doubtless, too, it explains why the four Emperors after Augustus were regarded as bloodthirsty tyrants and monsters.

Characters of Emperors. — The characters of these Emperors undoubtedly left much to be desired. Not one of them had the courage of Julius Cæsar or the statesmanship of Octavian. But circumstances helped to make tyrants of Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, and Nero.

Tiberius was a middle-aged general, a conscientious official, cold and cautious, and not in the least bloodthirsty, when he ascended the throne, but the executions of suspects in his reign gave him the name of tyrant. Caligula, a young man of twenty-five, was decidedly popular at the outset, but in four years earned a reputation for insane extravagance and inhuman cruelty. Claudius was a middle-aged and bookish person. Nero, who followed, was a seventeen-year-old boy, influenced by the philosopher Seneca. For a few years he seemed likely to prove an admirable ruler. Apparently his gravest fault was that he preferred poetry, painting, and music to the affairs of state. Yet soon we find Nero becoming a ruthless tyrant, murdering his brother, mother, and wife, sending men to death on the slightest suspicion, indulging in wild revelry in his great palace, or roaming through the slums with boon companions in search of drunken adventures. Clearly these four men were of very different types, yet all four became suspicious, and cruel in putting suspects to death. And not without reason. Caligula was murdered, Claudius poisoned, and Nero by suicide saved himself from assassination. After Nero, three successive Emperors rose and fell in one year (68–69 A.D.), of whom two were killed and one committed suicide.

The Rule of Philosophers and Generals

Revolt of Provincial Legions. — One of the weaknesses of the Augustan monarchy was that it was too Roman. Never visiting the provinces, never leading the legions, the Emperors lost the loyalty and respect of the provincial armies. After Nero's death the legions in Spain, in Gaul, in the Rhineland, along the Danube, and in the East all set up rival candidates for the throne. Vespasian (vĕs-pā′zhĭ-ăn), who finally won it, was first hailed as Emperor not at Rome, but in Judæa and Egypt, and then by the Danubian legions, which stormed Rome and compelled the Senate to elect him. Like Julius Cæsar and Augustus, he owed his position to the legions.

Vespasian. — Vespasian adopted the name of Cæsar because he wished to make himself successor of Cæsar rather than Nero. He tore down the Golden House of Nero, and on part of the land thus

cleared he built the Colosseum, that gigantic stone theater with its vast arena for pageants, beast-fighting, and gladiatorial shows. He had the colossal bronze statue of Nero altered so as to represent Apollo. The soldier-ruler had no desire to continue Nero's luxury and display. On the contrary, his energy was devoted to putting the administration in order again, filling the treasury, strengthening the frontiers, extending Roman citizenship to prominent indi-

EXTERIOR OF THE COLOSSEUM AS IT APPEARS TO-DAY

viduals in the provinces, filling vacant places in the Senate with able provincial officials, and increasing the political privileges of many provincial communities, especially in Spain. He seems to have realized that the Romanized provinces must be allowed to share in the imperial government. Most important of all were his military reforms. The provincial legions were henceforth recruited entirely outside of Italy, and each province was garrisoned by mixed troops from other provinces. The aim, of course, was to

remove the danger of provincial rebellions. To keep the Prætorian Guard at Rome in hand, he appointed his own son, Titus (tī′tŭs), as its commander (prefect). It was during Vespasian's reign that the Jews rebelled against Roman rule; and it was Titus who besieged, captured, and destroyed Jerusalem in the year 70 A.D.

Domitian. — Vespasian gave the monarchy a new lease of life. The fact that he reigned ten years (69–79 A.D.), died a natural death, and transmitted his power to his two sons, Titus (79–81) and Domitian (dŏ-mĭsh′ĭ-ăn, 81–96 A.D.), is an eloquent commentary on his success. The latter, however, nearly ruined his father's work. Like Caligula and Nero, he irritated the Roman aristocracy by claiming divinity. Roman senators did not willingly address him as "Lord and God." Nor did they enjoy his attempts to curb their vices and luxury by law. His ambitious wars in Britain, Germany, and the Balkan Peninsula meant heavier taxes, but did not result in brilliant victories which could make the taxes bearable. Worst of all, after the mutiny of an army in Germany, Domitian became fearful of assassination, and put hundreds of conspirators and supposed conspirators to death. He also increased the pay of the Prætorian Guard, hoping to bribe it to loyalty. Nevertheless, the officers of the Guard took part with his wife and his secretaries in a successful plot to murder him.

Nerva. — With Domitian out of the way, the Senate and the Prætorian Guard considered themselves the powers behind the throne. The former managed to install on the throne an elderly, learned, and upright senator, Nerva (96–98 A.D.), who promised never to execute a senator. The pledge was an indication of the determination of the senatorial nobility to end the terror under which it had lived. On the other hand, the Prætorian Guard looked on Nerva as a harmless old man who could be bullied at will. But the harmless old man was unwilling to be bullied; he adopted as son, heir, and joint ruler a bluff and fearless general, Trajan (trā′jăn), who ate salt pork and cheese with his soldiers and fenced with common privates for sport.

Trajan. — Soon afterward, Nerva's death left Trajan Emperor. By repeating Nerva's pledge to the Senate, and by treating that body with all outward signs of respect, Trajan won the devotion of

the nobles. By sternly sending the mutinous Prætorian Guardsmen to do active service in Germany, he cowed the Guard. By his simplicity of manner and his success as a commander he kept the army as a whole enthusiastically loyal. And by unparalleled generosity he pleased the Roman populace. He built enormous public baths. He enlarged the Great Circus, where chariot races were held. After his conquest of Dacia (Rumania), he celebrated his victories by four solid months of parades, games, and exhibitions in the arena. It is said that ten thousand gladiators and eleven thousand wild beasts were killed to make this occasion memorable.

TRAJAN

Trajan's reign (98–117 A.D.) had a deeper meaning. With him, the provinces began to rule Rome. He was the first Roman Emperor born outside Italy (in Spain). For nearly two years after his election he did not visit Rome, and much of his time after that was spent in distant wars.[1] From this time forward there was to be many a provincial on the throne. There were already many provincials in the Senate, mostly men from the well-Romanized provinces in Gaul and Spain. Perhaps their presence helps to explain the revival of public spirit, of morality and patriotism, in the Roman government of the second century.

[1] Notably his unsuccessful campaigns against the Parthians in the Near East. On the Parthians, see below, p. 354.

Hadrian. — Having no son to inherit the Empire, Trajan on his deathbed adopted as his heir a middle-aged cousin, Hadrian (hā′drĭ-ăn), who was at that time commanding the legions in Syria. On the whole it was a fortunate choice. Hadrian gave the Empire twenty-one years (117–138 A.D.) of good government.

Rome and the Empire. — Under Hadrian the supremacy of Italy in the Empire was further weakened. The Prætorian Guard at

HADRIAN'S TOMB

The large building on the right, originally constructed as the Emperor's tomb, was subsequently used by the Popes as a fortress and prison. It is now known as the Castel San Angelo.

Rome was now opened to picked veterans from the non-Italian provincial armies. That Rome, the city whose legions had once gone out to conquer the world, should now be ruled by a native of Spain, and should be garrisoned by troops from the conquered provinces, may seem strange. Yet it was not quite so strange as it appeared. It must be remembered that hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions all told, of veterans and emigrants from Italy

had founded colonies in the provinces, in times past. Doubtless many of the provincial soldiers who now came to Rome were of Roman or Italian ancestry (as Hadrian was), and all of them had at least become Roman enough to speak Latin.

Hadrian and the Provinces. — Though Hadrian spent much time in Rome and built his massive mausoleum on the banks of the Tiber, and added splendid temples and public buildings to the imperial city's architectural beauties, he was intensely interested in the provinces. Twice he made a tour of inspection requiring several years. Vigilantly he supervised the administration, ever alert to prevent oppression of the subject peoples. Many a new city was chartered by him, and many an older city beautified. He completed the great temple of Olympian Zeus at Athens, and built a whole new section of that city. For all his interest in the provinces, he was not eager to annex more. Indeed, he actually gave up lands conquered by Trajan east of the Euphrates.

Influence of Stoic Philosophy. — Both Trajan and Hadrian were strongly influenced by philosophers. In their day Stoic philosophy, with its emphasis on virtuous living, and with its ideal of a monarch who would be the wise and benevolent father of a free people, had become very widespread among the upper classes. Trajan encouraged philosophers to propagate this doctrine of benevolent monarchy. Hadrian paid salaries to Greek professors of philosophy. But the two succeeding Emperors were themselves philosophers. Antoninus, adopted as heir by the childless Hadrian, was conscientiously devoted to duty, and if there is little to write of his rather long reign (138–161 A.D.) it is to his credit.

Marcus Aurelius. — Still more striking an exemplar of Stoic virtues was the next ruler, Marcus Aurelius. Descended from a Spanish family that had been ennobled by Vespasian, he had been very carefully educated by tutors, and even as a boy was a model of intelligence and good behavior. At the age of seventeen he was adopted as heir by Antoninus. He was gradually introduced into governmental affairs while his education and reading were continued. At the age of forty he became Emperor.

His twenty years (161–180 A.D.) in power were years of steady devotion to duty. Being Emperor according to his ideals was no

life of ease. Scorning luxury, he lived almost as simply as if he had been a poor man. Believing that he should be at the service of all who needed to consult him, he worked from morning till night. Even when he sat in his imperial box at the circus, the theater, or the Colosseum, while others were applauding the actors or the gladiators, the royal philosopher was reading, or listening to reports, or writing notes.

MARCUS AURELIUS

There is not space here to enter into details regarding the laws he passed to carry out his ideas of humanity and justice. But it is worth while to appreciate the principles in which he believed. His book of philosophical reflections or *Meditations* gives us a more intimate glimpse of his mind than we have of any other ancient ruler. We see him vaguely uncertain about the gods and the future life, but intensely earnest about humanity and reason. The supreme goal to be achieved is peace of soul, tranquillity, and it is to be reached by the practice of the four cardinal Stoic virtues — wisdom, justice, fortitude, and temperance.

Commodus. — For almost a century no Emperor had had a son to whom he could leave the throne, and for that reason the monarchy had been passed on to men selected for their character and ability. Unfortunately for Rome, Marcus Aurelius had a son,

Commodus (kŏm′ŏ-dŭs, 180–192 A.D.), who was unlike his father in every way. He would have been an admirable athlete or gladiator, but he was neither a statesman nor a philosopher. Proud of his physical strength, he entered the arena as a gladiator, to do battle with beasts and slaves. Such exploits, and his fondness for luxury, and his neglect of public affairs, disgusted serious-minded senators. In the end he was poisoned and strangled.

The Later Empire

Civil War and Severus. — Once more, after a century and a quarter of internal peace, Rome was torn by civil war. The events of the year 68–69 were repeated in 192–193 A.D. The Prætorian Guard at Rome and the armies in Britain, in Syria, and on the Danube all put forward their candidates for the throne. Only after a bloody civil war did one of them, Septimius Severus (sĕ-vē′rŭs) emerge triumphant in blood-stained purple. Severus, note well, was a native of Punic Africa, who had learned Latin, worked his way up in officialdom under Marcus Aurelius, and leaped from command of the army on the Danube to rulership of the Roman world. No Augustus, not even a Vespasian, was this Romanized general, but a military dictator pure and simple. Twelve of his eighteen years as Emperor were spent campaigning in the half-conquered island of Britain and in the East. His most important and most dangerous policy was the wholesale execution of wealthy Romans and the confiscation of their estates to pay his soldiers. That, of course, was no novelty. It had been done by the first Cæsar and by Augustus, and very recently by Commodus. But from this time forward it became a regular practice. Its evils were threefold: it killed off able and cultured men; it provided every army and every ambitious general with an incentive to seize power and plunder; and it made terrible inroads on the prosperity of the Empire.

Thirty Emperors. — After the death of Septimius Severus and the assassination of his son Caracalla six years later, 217 A.D., the Empire during more than half a century was simply a battlefield for rival military adventurers, seeking supreme power for themselves and loot for their troops. In fifty-three years there were

thirty Emperors, an average of one every two years, not counting the numerous pretenders who did not win recognition. Many of them were of barbarian stock, only half-Romanized. Only one died a natural death; the others were no sooner seated on the throne than they were murdered. For a fleeting moment an able Danubian peasant-general, Aurelian (270–275 A.D.), restored order and unity, but he too was murdered, as were his three successors.

Effects of Civil Wars. — The long-continued civil wars of the third century had four important effects. (1) They led to autocracy. (2) They destroyed the overlordship of the city of Rome and the people of Italy over the provinces. Italy became an ordinary province, governed like any other. Rome remained the capital only in name, as the real seat of government was in the army camps. Roman citizenship was extended by the Emperor Caracalla, in the year 212 A.D., to all freeborn inhabitants of the Empire. (3) The cities throughout the Empire showed a marked decline, partly because they were so often subjected to spoliation and extortion by the soldiery, and partly because the lack of security and the reappearance of piracy discouraged commerce. (4) The struggles within the Empire left the frontiers poorly defended, with the result that barbarians were able to invade and pillage Gaul, Greece, and other provinces. The barbarian invasions, of which more will be said in a later chapter, were beginning.

Diocletian. — Out of this pitiable state of affairs order was brought once more by Diocletian (dī′ŏ-klē′shăn), a Romanized Illyrian, born in Dalmatia, who arrived at supreme power by the familiar path of military leadership and usurpation. As Emperor, from 284 to 305 A.D., he not only restored order, crushed rebellions, and reconquered lost provinces (Britain, Armenia, Mesopotamia), but also reformed the government. Realizing that the Empire was too large to be well administered by one man in these troublous times, he appointed an assistant Emperor with the title "Augustus" and two other assistants with the title "Cæsar." The Empire was divided into 101 "provinces," which were grouped together in 13 "dioceses," and these in turn formed four groups. One of these was ruled by Diocletian, one by the assistant Emperor, and one by each of the two "Cæsars." Diocletian

reformed the army. He also revised the system of taxation, making annual assessments on cultivated land and requiring regular payments in gold and goods by the cities. In his effort to re-establish prosperity he even tried to fix the prices of all goods and of labor by an imperial decree, violations of which were punishable by death, but he soon had to abandon the attempt. He was frankly an autocrat, wearing the diadem and jewelled robe of an oriental king, styling himself *Dominus* (Lord) and *Jovius* (descendant of Jupiter) as well as Augustus.

Constantine.—After Diocletian's abdication (305 A.D.)[1], there was again a brief period of conflict among rival Emperors, until

ARCH OF CONSTANTINE AT ROME

Constantine the Great emerged victorious, first as joint Emperor, then as sole "Augustus" (324–337 A.D.). Constantine carried

[1] Diocletian *abdicated* the throne. That is, he resigned of his own accord and retired to private life. He is one of a very small number of monarchs in history who have freely abdicated.

Diocletian's policies still farther. The mobile field army, so essential if insurrections and barbarian invasions were to be defeated, was further enlarged and strengthened. The civil administration of the provinces was made still more systematic, under a host of civil service officials of various grades and ranks. Constantine, because he was a convert to Christianity, did not consider himself a god, as Diocletian had done, but he did regard himself as an absolute ruler, and surrounded himself with truly royal pomp and ceremony.

Constantinople. — It was Constantine who transferred the court from Rome to the East. On the small peninsula on the European shore of the Bosphorus, at the crossroads between Europe and Asia, he enlarged the old Greek city of Byzantium and named it Constantinople. This was to be the "New Rome," the seat of the government and royal palace. And the free bread which had formerly been distributed in the old Rome was now given to the citizens of the new capital.

Later History of the Empire. — How Constantine adopted Christianity, how the Christian Church developed in his and later reigns, how the barbarians on the northern frontier became increasingly troublesome, will be told in Part V.[1] Here we can merely sketch the events which round out the story of the ancient Roman Empire. After Constantine's death his sons Constans and Constantius became joint Emperors, to be followed by one of their cousins, the Pagan Julian,[2] last of the dynasty, and he in turn was followed by generals set up by the army. As the fourth century wore on, the custom developed of having two Emperors, one in the East and one in the West. In the fifth century, the western Empire ceased to exist, and in its place independent kingdoms arose under barbarian chieftains.[3]

Partial unity was restored for a time, in the sixth century, by Justinian (527–565 A.D.), Emperor of the East, who reconquered Italy, Africa, and the Mediterranean, and who earned immortal fame by issuing the great code of Roman law about which more will be said on another page.[4] Here we may simply note that after Justinian East and West again parted company, and the eastern

[1] See pp. 429–461. [2] See p. 431. [3] See p. 449. [4] See pp. 359–360, 452–454.

Empire became practically a Greek Empire. Justinian was the last of the Emperors who spoke Latin as his native tongue and used it as the language of the government at Constantinople. Though the "Roman Empire," so-called, continued to exist in the East until 1453 A.D., and was revived by medieval German Kings in the West, where its name survived until 1806 A.D., there was in truth no longer a Roman Empire. It had ceased to be Roman.

The Roman World and Its Frontiers

It has been a long story, this tale of how the farmers of Rome grasped the scepter of the civilized Mediterranean world, and lost it. It has carried us from the days of the first Roman contest with Carthage (264 B.C.) to the death of Justinian, the last of the Latin-speaking "Roman" Emperors, more than eight hundred years later. Now, at the end of the story, we may well take stock of Rome's achievement.

Mastery of the Mediterranean. — Rome was the first and only power to conquer the whole "circle of lands" surrounding the Mediterranean Sea. The Egyptian Empire had been essentially a land empire built up along the River Nile. The Babylonian and Assyrian Empires had arisen on river banks and extended themselves on land. The Persians had never been at home on the sea. Alexander the Great had marched overland to make his conquests. The maritime empire of Athens had centered in the island-sprinkled Ægean Sea, and never mastered the larger Mediterranean. The ships of Carthage had been able to dominate only the western corner of the great sea. But the Romans, landlubbers as they were at the outset, launched fleets of many-oared galleys that ruled the entire Mediterranean. They made it an "interior sea," a Roman lake, bordered by Roman

Courtesy of the Philadelphia Commercial Museum

A Roman Merchant Ship

lands. It was in very truth what its name implies, "the center of the land." Through it Roman armies sailed to conquer Carthage and Egypt and Syria and Greece. Across its broad blue surface cruised merchant vessels carrying the wheat of Egypt to the city of Rome, or the glassware of Italy to African buyers. It was the heart of the Empire.

Extension of Culture in Europe. — Rome's mastery of the Mediterranean had the effect of bringing the ancient, cultured East into closer contact with the formerly barbarous West. On one hand the Empire included the ancient homes of civilization in Egypt, Crete, Syria and Asia Minor, and Greece. These countries might well be called the Hellenistic World, for they were the lands in which ancient east-Mediterranean civilizations had blended into Hellenistic culture. The Empire also included the Punic or Carthaginian World. With the Hellenistic and Punic worlds it united the lands of southwestern Europe, whose peoples had hitherto been ignorant farmers and rude barbarians. Italy, Spain, Gaul, and Britain were the most important of the lands that thus became direct heirs of ancient civilization. And although in later ages, as we shall read, floods of barbarian invaders will pour into these lands, and almost extinguish Roman institutions in Britain, nevertheless Italy, Spain, and Gaul will remain permanently Romanized. The languages of modern Spain and Portugal and France and southern Belgium, of southern Switzerland, and of Italy, to this day are living witnesses of Rome's influence, for they are all derived largely from the Latin tongue of ancient Rome. Modern Rumanian, we may add, is also one of these "Romance" languages, although Rumania was under Roman rule less than two centuries.

The Northern Frontier. — The frontier between Roman and barbarian Europe did not become at all definite until the time of Augustus. Before his reign, Rome's method of dealing with troublesome neighbors had been to conquer them. But the more Rome conquered, the more she had to defend. By the time of Augustus, the problem was how to secure natural frontiers that could be easily defended. On the north of Italy, the Alps might appear to be such a frontier. But Augustus found that the war-

like mountaineers were making occasional forays into Roman territory. Accordingly, he sent armies to conquer the Alpine region, and the northern slopes of the Alps, as far as the Danube River. Thus the provinces of Rhætia, Noricum, and Pannonia were annexed. Augustus also attempted to conquer the German tribes between the Rhine and the Elbe. Only the annihilation of three legions in the Teutoburg Forest by Arminius, a German chieftain, discouraged the plan.

Camps, Roads, and Cities. — From the time of Augustus, then, to the collapse of the Roman Empire, the Rhine and the Danube

Relief from Trajan's Column at Rome

were the chief boundaries between the Roman world and the less civilized part of Europe. Along this frontier Augustus stationed his legions in permanent fortified camps. From each camp military roads were constructed to strategic points, and small forts were built along the roads. In course of time these camps were all connected by fine military highways, running parallel to the rivers, and linked up with the rest of the Empire by other highways, along which passed both troops and merchants. Around the more important camps cities grew up. Have you ever noticed that the



THE MAIN ROMAN ROADS

chief cities along the Rhine are on the western bank, and that the chief cities of the Danube are on the southern bank? They were once Roman encampments, and were naturally constructed on the Roman side of the frontier. You can easily find them on the map.

Dacia. — In two places the Romans held lands beyond these river frontiers for a considerable time. Dacia (modern Rumania), to the north of the lower Danube, was conquered by the warlike Trajan in the years 101–106 A.D., and Roman colonists were settled there, but a century and a half later most of the province was overrun by barbarians, and finally it was altogether abandoned.

Fortifications. — The other extension of the frontier was to protect the weak angle between the upper Rhine and the upper Danube, where the rivers were too narrow to be of much value as an obstacle to invaders. The German-speaking tribes in the salient between the two rivers were conquered by Vespasian (69–79 A.D.). To defend this new province (Agri Decumates or Titheland), a later Emperor built a chain of small earthen forts and wooden watchtowers along the frontier, and, some distance behind, larger stone fortresses which housed strong garrisons. Soon it seemed necessary to connect the border forts with a wooden palisade. Then a ditch was dug in front of the palisade, and along at least part of the line a stone wall was built. That symbolized what was happening to the Empire. As centuries passed, it could rely less on its soldiers, and had to rely more on stone walls to protect it from barbarian inroads. And even the walls failed.

Hadrian's Wall. — It was the same story in Britain. The Romans conquered England and Wales, but not the mountaineers of the Scottish Highlands. Against the latter, the Emperor Hadrian had his troops throw up a wall of turf, stretching right across the island, from the River Tyne to the Solway Firth. One of his successors built a stone wall, with forts and towers at frequent intervals, along the line Hadrian had chosen. It must have been an immense labor to build this wall, eight feet thick and fourteen feet high, and perhaps eighty miles long. For more than two centuries the wall sheltered Roman Britain. By the irony of fate, the invaders who finally destroyed Roman rule in Britain came

from the Continent, in ships, against which the northern wall was no protection.

The Southern Frontier. — The other frontiers of the Roman Empire were of a different sort. On the south, in Africa, the great desert was more effective than any wall. It separated the rich provinces of Roman North Africa from the uncivilized negro tribes of the tropics.

Eastern Frontiers. — In Asia, where Rome held Asia Minor and Syria, there was also a desert barrier — the Arabian desert, only the fringes of which were ever really conquered by Rome.[1] That checked Roman expansion to the south and southeast of Syria. Farther north, however, on the borders of northern Syria and Asia Minor, there was no such natural limit. As a result the boundary was moved back and forth by frequent wars. Much of the time, Rome held upper Mesopotamia, the region between the Tigris and the great bend of the Euphrates, as a province, and controlled Armenia as a vassal kingdom. But Roman domination of Armenia and northern Mesopotamia was stubbornly contested by a powerful enemy.

The Parthian Empire. — To explain the situation, it is necessary to recall something of the history of Western Asia. For thousands of years there had always been a powerful empire in Western Asia. The ancient Babylonian Empire had been followed by an Assyrian, then a new Babylonian, then a Persian Empire, then the Empire of Alexander the Great. After Alexander's death, one of his generals, Seleucus, had founded the Seleucid Empire, stretching from the Mediterranean to the Indus River. When that broke up, its place was taken by the Parthian Empire,[2] which flourished under a ruling family known as the Arsacid (är-săs′ĭd) dynasty for four centuries (from 170 B.C. to 226 A.D.), controlling Mesopotamia and Persia. During most of its existence, this Parthian (or Arsacid) Empire fought intermittent wars with Rome, for the control of Mesopotamia and Armenia. Often the swift Parthian horsemen,

[1] The desert of Sinai, between Syria, Egypt, and the Red Sea, was a Roman province, and was called Arabia.

[2] Parthia was the name of the country corresponding to the modern Khorasan, southeast of the Caspian Sea. It was inhabited by "Parthians," a people similar to the Persians in language and religion.

armed with javelin and bow, inflicted defeats on the Roman infantry; but the Parthian army, made up of noblemen with their slaves and retainers, rarely proved able to follow up its victories.

At the outset, the Parthian Empire, although fundamentally Persian in language and religion, inherited from the Seleucids a certain amount of Hellenistic culture. Parthian Emperors, for example, used the Greek language on their coins and in their inscriptions. The city of Seleucia, on the Tigris, had an influential Greek population, and was a center of Hellenism. But after the destruction of Seleucia by Roman troops in the year 164 A.D., Hellenism in Parthia rapidly died out, and Aramaic (a Semitic tongue) and Persian (an Aryan tongue) took the place of Greek as the official languages of the government. The abandonment of the Greek language by the ruling class was simply a symptom that the Parthian lands east of the Euphrates were parting company with the Roman-Hellenistic civilization of the lands to the west.

The Sassanid Empire. — The Parthian Empire was overthrown by a strong military leader, who made himself ruler of Persia and Babylonia and founded the Sassanid (săs′ȧ-nĭd) Empire (226–651 A.D.), with its capital at Ctesiphon (tĕs′ĭ-fŏn), on the Tigris, but with its heart in Persia. It was really a revival of the old Persian Empire, from which it inherited the Zoroastrian religion and the tradition of world domination. From the outset the Sassanids proved to be troublesome neighbors for Rome. Again and again they invaded Syria and other provinces, and disputed Rome's overlordship of Armenia. Once they captured a Roman Emperor in battle. After the Roman Empire adopted Christianity, the chronic conflicts between Rome and the Sassanids took on the nature of a religious war between Christianity and the Persian worship of Mazda. Although there were intervals of peace, the Roman Empire never enjoyed real security against the Sassanids.

Pax Romana. — While the frontiers of the Roman world were being defended by means of walls and fortresses and almost incessant border wars, there was peace within the frontiers. It is true that one might get the opposite impression from a hasty reading of the history of Roman civil wars. But as a matter of fact there was almost uninterrupted peace within the Empire from the

accession of Augustus (14 B.C.) to the brief civil wars of 68–69 A.D., and from 69 A.D. to the murder of Commodus in 192 A.D. That makes about two centuries of peace. To be sure, this Roman Peace (*Pax Romana*) was not the result of voluntary agreement among free nations. It was imposed upon conquered nations by Roman arms. But it was peace. Before the rise of Rome, the Mediterranean world had been the arena of innumerable rivalries

MODERN REMAINS OF TRAJAN'S FORUM

and wars. War had been the great enemy of commerce and culture. War had destroyed more than one noble civilization. The Roman Peace was the greatest contribution of Rome to the progress of mankind. It meant unprecedented prosperity. It gave birth to scores of thriving cities. It enabled the civilized arts of peace to flourish and spread as never before. It marked the climax of classical civilization in the Mediterranean world.

Government and Law

Roman Influence on Government. — Besides establishing peace, the Romans made very important contributions to the development of government and law. For one thing, Rome provided the most conspicuous example of republican government in ancient history. True, there had been earlier republics, particularly in Athens and other Greek city-states, but none of these was so successful as Rome in acquiring and administering an extensive territory. Modern ideas of republican government have been very strongly influenced by Roman traditions. The very words "republic" and "liberty" are derived from Latin. In choosing officials modern democratic governments follow the Roman practice of election, rather than the characteristic Athenian practice of selection by lot. Likewise senates remind us of Rome. It was to Roman history that French and American constitution-makers in the eighteenth century turned for republican ideas and precedents.

On the other hand, Rome bequeathed to the modern world traditions of autocracy as well as of republicanism. Ancient Rome had her dictators, such as Sulla, Pompey, and Cæsar, as well as her republican Senate and popular Assemblies. The word "dictator" and the idea of dictatorship in time of crisis both come down to us from Roman times. Likewise the titles "Emperor" and "Prince" are merely forms of the titles *imperator* and *princeps*, which were borne by the monarchs of later Roman history. The scepter (*sceptrum* in Latin), the diadem, the throne, the robe of royal purple, and other trappings of monarchy were borrowed by Rome from older autocracies and passed on down to modern emperors and kings.

Administration. — In methods of governing a large empire, Rome surpassed all her forerunners. In the conquered provinces at first Rome merely installed her governor and his staff, and collected tribute, but left the existing city-states, monarchies, and tribes as local governments. As time went on, however, the governor and his staff took over more and more of the business of administration. Wherever possible the conquered populations were gradually organized into towns and cities on a fairly uniform

pattern. Gradually, too, such provincial towns were raised in rank and given more privileges, until they received the Roman franchise.

Thus Roman citizenship was extended, step by step, outside of Italy, throughout the Empire. That meant the extension of Roman law and Roman forms of municipal self-government. But the Roman Republic was never transformed into a federal government which would give satisfactory representation to the parts of the Empire outside the immediate vicinity of the city of Rome. Instead, as we have already seen, the need of a central administration capable of governing a vast Empire was filled by the growth of an imperial monarchy, with an imperial army and a staff of imperial officials subject to the Emperor's will. The imperial staff of officials became larger, in course of time, and more elaborately graded into ranks with titles and insignia of honor, until by the fourth century it was a marvel of systematic organization.

Progress of Law. — The progress of law went hand in hand with the development of political institutions. The Romans were the greatest lawmakers of antiquity. Their codes of law have profoundly influenced the legal systems of modern civilized nations. Our words for law, legal, legislation, justice, equity, and judge are all derived from the Latin language.

The earliest laws of the Roman city-state were simple and severe, and not very different in kind from the laws of other ancient peoples. Their evolution was due primarily to the fact that Rome's imperial expansion made human relationships more complex. (1) For example, the growth of wealth, of large-scale business and finance, called for more elaborate laws regarding property, business contracts, and inheritance. (2) The growth of wealth during the last days of the Republic and the early days of the Empire was accompanied by a decline of morality, a weakening of family ties among the ruling class, and an increase in the number of divorce cases and lawsuits regarding inheritances. These things, too, called forth elaborate legislation. (3) The growth of Rome's Empire and commerce meant that the courts had to deal with many foreigners, who had very different conceptions of law. Soon it was necessary to appoint a special judge of aliens to decide lawsuits among foreigners in Rome. In the provinces, Roman governors met the

same problem, of trying to administer justice to people whose customs were different from those of Rome. Instead, therefore, of applying Roman laws strictly, the judge of aliens and the provincial governors guided their decisions partly by customs prevailing among the foreigners, and partly by general principles of justice.

Varieties of Law. — As a result, several different kinds of law grew up. There were the laws passed by the Roman government, binding on Roman citizens but not on aliens and subject peoples. These laws, often inadequate and antiquated, were interpreted and supplemented by what we might call "judge-made laws"; for it was the custom of each judge, at the beginning of his term of office, to issue an "edict" stating what principles he would enforce in certain cases. Then there was another set of judge-made laws for aliens and foreigners. Such complications naturally gave birth to a class of professional lawyers and teachers of law. Augustus appointed several of the most distinguished lawyers to advise judges as to what the law actually was, in cases of dispute. The opinions of legal experts were given great weight. Three centuries later we find a Roman Emperor decreeing that in cases of dispute the party that cites the greatest number of such opinions is to win the lawsuit. But there were so many laws and precedents and opinions that even a very learned lawyer with a large library at his disposal could hardly claim to know what the law was. The task of gathering all the laws and decisions together, and boiling them down into a simple code, was one of the things Cæsar had in mind, but never accomplished. It was not accomplished until the reign of the Emperor Justinian in the sixth century A.D.

Justinian. — Justinian, it may be recalled,[1] was the last of the Latin-speaking Emperors. Apparently he was a man of tremendous energy. It is said that he could work most of the night, as well as all day, and still remain fresh, ruddy of complexion, and ready for more work. Certainly he accomplished many things, and if they were not all done well, at least they were all done with a will. But Justinian is known above all for his codification of the Roman laws.

[1] See p. 348.

Justinian's Code. — Hardly had he ascended the imperial throne when he appointed a committee of eminent lawyers to form a Code of laws by collecting the "constitutions" or edicts and decrees issued by previous Emperors. The word "Code," by the way, comes from an old Latin word (*codex*) meaning a book. After a Code had been compiled, containing all the laws, the greatest task of all was undertaken. A committee of sixteen lawyers was ordered to make a collection of the opinions of all the leading legal writers of the past centuries. The committee took three years for this immense labor. Two thousand books on law were read. Out of them the committee culled over nine thousand (9123) extracts, from the works of thirty-nine different legal writers. These extracts were edited and arranged by topic. They form what is known as Justinian's "Digest." Henceforth no lawyer would have to ransack his libraries to find copies of rare and ancient works from which opinions could be quoted. He had only to turn to the Digest. No other opinions, besides those quoted there, were to be regarded as valid. And no more commentaries were to be written on the law, so Justinian ordained. For the use of students, he had his lawyers prepare a little textbook known as the "Institutes," setting forth the principles of Roman law. He had a revised "Code" of laws prepared, containing 4652 statutes. And in following years, from time to time, he issued new laws to amend or supplement the Code. Taken all together, the Code, the Digest, the Institutes, and the supplements are often referred to as the "Corpus Juris Civilis" (Body of the Civil [1] Law) of Justinian.

Comparison with Early Laws. — If one compares Justinian's Corpus with the early Roman laws, one is struck by the progress made by Roman law during the ten centuries that separate the primitive Twelve Tables[2] from the final compilation.

Not only have the laws become more numerous, more detailed, and more suitable to a highly developed civilization, but they have changed in character. They have become more reasonable and

[1] By Justinian's time, the old distinction between the Civil Law (for Romans only) and the Law of Nations (for non-Romans) had disappeared, as Roman citizenship had been extended throughout the Empire. See p. 346.

[2] See p. 256.

more humane. Two examples may be given. No longer does the father of a family (*paterfamilias*) wield the power of life and death over his grown children; no longer can he inflict cruel punishments upon them; no longer can he expose a newborn infant to death by starvation or cold, as ancient Romans had done when they wished to limit the size of their families; no longer can he sell his children, except in case of extreme poverty.

Similarly, in the matter of slavery, the growing humanity of the law may be seen. In bygone days the slave had been his master's absolute property, to do with as he saw fit. Justinian's laws do not forbid slavery, but they do give the slaves legal protection against cruel masters, and they do encourage the freeing of slaves by

ROMAN MARRIAGE SCENE
From an ancient painting.

making the act of emancipation simpler and easier. Humane developments might also be traced in the laws dealing with the rights of women and children, and in the penalties for crimes, and in the growth of the idea that men are by nature equal, and should be equal before the law.

To some extent these alterations in the spirit of the law were due to the blending of the old Roman law with the more equitable principles applied in the courts for aliens and foreigners. But there were other influences that probably had greater weight.

Influence of Stoicism. — Another factor making for more humane and reasonable laws was the Stoic philosophy, which was practically the religion of some of the greatest legal experts of the first and second centuries A.D. As Stoicism is discussed in another

place,[1] here we need only to remember that the Stoics regarded reason as the law of nature and the basis of all law and justice. They therefore endeavored to interpret the law so as to make it more reasonable, more natural, and more equal for all men. The more radical of the Stoics even went so far as to assert that slavery was not justified by the law of nature.

Influence of Christianity. — Finally, a third and very influential cause of legal progress was the Christian religion, of which Justinian himself was a zealous adherent. Christianity caused a thorough revision of the laws on marriage and divorce. It helped to weaken the position of slavery. A religion which teaches the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man could hardly fail to exercise some influence against slavery and in protection of the unfortunate and the weak.

Economic Results of Imperialism

Trade Expansion. — Roman peace and Roman law meant economic prosperity on a scale hitherto unknown during the first two centuries of the Empire. Merchant vessels sailing across the Mediterranean were no longer menaced by hostile fleets or by pirates. Merchants travelling by land enjoyed the protection of Roman law and order. The marvellous network of military highways promoted trade, not only in the older parts of the Empire, but also in the border provinces. Roman coins, universally accepted as standard currency, likewise helped to facilitate business transactions. In short, peace, order, law, roads, and common coinage all contributed to make possible a remarkable expansion of trade. Trade increased not only in volume, but in extent. The part of Europe conquered by Rome entered actively into the Mediterranean business world. Exports from the Roman Empire were carried far and wide, even beyond the frontiers, to Scandinavia, Germany, Russia, India,[2] China,[3] the East Indies, Arabia, and central Africa. And in return, the Roman world received foreign luxuries from these far distant lands.

Unhappily it must be added that after the second century civil wars within the Empire hindered commerce and almost ruined

[1] See pp. 239–240, 343. [2] See p. 388. [3] See pp. 398–399.

business at times. Pirates again infested the sea. And by Justinian's time, business was still more seriously injured by barbarian invasions which will be described later.

Mass Production and Regional Specialization. — The growth of commerce had a remarkable effect on agriculture and industry. When Italian farmers found that grain could be imported more cheaply than it could be grown at home, many of them grew less grain and specialized on the production of wine and oil, which could be sold at a profit not only in Italy but also in the provinces. Italian lamp-makers made lamps for the whole civilized world. One locality specialized in making bricks, another in forging iron and steel, and a third in glass or in bronze. Italy exported wine, olive oil, pottery, metalware. Egypt shipped grain, linen, and paper, as well as certain oriental luxuries, to Italy. The other African provinces became great producers of grain, fruit, and oil. Spain had metals as well as olive oil to export. Gaul became remarkably prosperous after a century or so of Roman rule, because Gallic wine, pottery, woollen cloaks, linen, safety pins, and metalware of various sorts won their way into the markets of the Mediterranean. In short there was a tendency toward mass production of specialties, and toward the exchange of such specialties among the producing regions. The modern world, to be sure, has gone much farther than Rome along these lines, but the point to be made here is that Rome went farther than earlier empires.

Cities. — The growth of Roman trade and industry had such far-reaching results that we can only suggest a few of them here. For one thing, it meant the rise of commercial and industrial towns. The new cities that arose as if by magic in Gaul and Spain and elsewhere were centers of culture. A typical provincial city was laid out in squares, with a stadium and fine public buildings and theaters, public libraries, public baths, council halls, temples, and churches. The private dwellings and apartment houses were often well built of stone or marble. Some of them were equipped with surprisingly good plumbing. The more luxurious of them must have been sumptuously beautiful in their day. For wherever there were cities, there were wealthy merchants, bankers, and contractors, who took pride in being generous patrons of the arts.

Labor. — On the other hand, the expansion of trade did not necessarily mean wealth for the masses. The laboring classes could perhaps enjoy gazing at beautiful public buildings, or sitting in public theaters, or using a public bath. But by contrast with the luxury of the rich, the condition of the workers was relatively worse than in earlier times. In the cities, many of the workers were slaves, toiling for the profit of their owners. Free workers (and there was a considerable number of them) had to compete with slave labor.

A Relief from the Arch of Marcus Aurelius

Growth of Serfdom. — In the country, during the early days of the Empire, the smaller farms were tilled by peasant-owners, and the large plantations were cultivated by slaves. As generations passed, more and more of the small farms were swallowed up by the big plantations and vast cattle ranches. These large estates owned by very wealthy men are usually termed *latifundia* (lăt-ĭ-fŭn′dĭ-ȧ). Meanwhile, thousands of former farmer-landowners became tenants (*coloni*), paying a percentage of their crops to their landlords as rent. On the other hand, many of the slaves were emancipated. Thus tenant labor gradually replaced slave labor on many plantations. When tenants, however, showed a disposition to move into the cities, or to migrate in search of

better land, the government forbade them to leave their farms. In other words, they were obliged to remain in the same locality, generation after generation. Such compulsory tenants are known as "serfs."

Agriculture. — Grain, vegetables, olives, grapes, and cattle were grown by methods that had long been known. The plough used by a Roman farmer was a very simple affair, which could not dig deep into heavy soil, or turn the soil over in a regular furrow. Grain was cut with a sickle and threshed either with a flail or by tramping it on a threshing floor. The rotation of crops and the use of fertilizers were practised to some extent. In Egypt, of course, irrigation was continued under Roman rule, as under the Pharaohs. On the whole, it may be said that the Romans only continued and spread more widely the agricultural methods and implements which were already in use. Some historians believe that the lack of progress in agriculture, resulting in exhaustion of the fertility of the soil, was one of the chief reasons for the gradual weakening and final collapse of the Empire. In other words, the Empire did not have a firm enough agricultural foundation.

Industrial Methods. — In industry, men continued to work with relatively simple tools. Labor-saving machinery would have increased the output enormously. But the Romans made few inventions. They did not even apply in industry the scientific knowledge which they inherited from the Hellenistic age. It is said that an inventor presented a machine of some sort to the Emperor Vespasian, but Vespasian put the invention idly to one side because it would throw so many people out of work if it were applied. Probably employers, who had plenty of slave labor, or of cheap free labor, at their command, could not see the value of labor-saving inventions. Moreover, it may be true, as one historian suggests, that the demand for manufactures was not enough to stimulate inventions. Whatever the reason may have been, the fact remains clear. The Roman Empire meant the spreading of such industries as pottery, bronze-working, iron-work, glass-making, and cloth manufacture into hitherto non-industrial countries like Gaul and Spain, but it did not mean much improvement in the methods of industry. The chief exceptions to this

generalization were the increased use of pulleys, levers, cranes, and pumps, and the discovery in the fourth century A.D. of a better method of melting iron by using an improved bellows with a charcoal fire.

Paternalism. — An interesting feature of Roman economic history was the growth of government control of business. In the early days of the Roman Empire, the government interfered very little with industry and trade. Gradually, however, the government became more and more involved in economic affairs. On one hand, the confiscation of the property of rebels and enemies made the Emperor personally the greatest landowner in the world, while on the other hand, the Emperor assumed the cost of public buildings, roads, army pensions, and supplying the people of the city of Rome with grain and circuses. By the third century A.D. we find the Emperor distributing olive oil, bread, and even wine to the Roman populace.

Trade Unions and Government Control.—Likewise, during the first three centuries of the Empire, the government increased its control over trade organizations. In each trade there were associations or unions (*collegia*) somewhat like craft gilds,[1] but not very similar to modern trade unions. For these organizations the government decreed elaborate regulations, which grew more and more rigid, until by the time of Constantine, in the early fourth century, the law required the son of a baker to be a baker and belong to his father's union. There were hereditary unions of butchers, wine-dealers, oil-merchants, shipowners, etc. Agricultural workers or tenants, as we have seen, were also bound to their tasks by the law forbidding them to move away from their land. The growth of governmental control was a general process. The Roman Empire began with economic liberty. It ended with laws that attached the great mass of men to hereditary economic positions, either as agricultural tenants or as members of some trade or other.

Decline of Prosperity. — Partly because of the growth of serfdom, and perhaps partly because of the rigid regulation of industry, the prosperity of the Empire suffered a decline during the

[1] See pp. 545–549.

third, fourth, and fifth centuries A.D. An even more serious cause of this decline was the frequency of civil war during this period. Moreover, during these centuries the burden of taxation became almost unbearable. If the soil was also losing its fertility, as some authorities believe, we may add soil exhaustion to the list of reasons why the flourishing economic life of the early Empire was followed by a decrease of production and a falling-off of business and trade.

Græco-Roman Culture

Luxuriance of Fine Arts. — The internal peace and prosperity which characterized the first two centuries of the Roman Empire were reflected in the fine arts. The ruling classes had time and money for art. Magnificent public buildings, triumphal arches, imperial palaces, and private mansions were constructed, not only in Rome, but also in the other cities of the Empire. Never before had there been a period of two centuries in which there was so *much* architecture, sculpture, and painting. No other Empire has ever left so many ruins.

Hellenistic Influence. — As to the quality of Roman art, opinions differ. To a considerable extent, Roman art was a continuation of the Hellenistic art which has been discussed in an earlier chapter.[1] Indeed, much of the sculpture, painting, and building in Roman days was the work of Greek and other Near Eastern artists. The art of the Near East was spread over a much larger area.

Sculpture. — As regards sculpture, such an infinite multitude of statues and carvings were made to adorn public buildings, palaces, triumphal arches and columns, mansions, and tombs, that much of the work must have been mediocre. But some of the statues are amazingly lifelike. Sculptors reproduced even the smallest details of armor, or of dress, or of facial expression. They made statues of real persons, rather than of idealized figures.[2]

Painting and Mosaic. — Painting was another popular art, learned from Greece and Hellenistic Egypt. Wealthy men had the

[1] See pp. 230–231.

[2] See illustrations on pp. 293, 300, 305, 311, 313, 317, 323, 326, 328, 351.

walls of their mansions richly adorned with paintings or with mosaics. Some of the mosaics were so skillfully made, with a hundred to a hundred and sixty cubes of colored stone or glass to the square inch, that at a distance they can hardly be distinguished from paintings.

The Arch in Architecture. — In architecture there was more spectacular progress. At the outset, the Romans had to learn all

THE ARCH OF TITUS

they knew of architecture from the Etruscans and the Greeks. A great deal of Roman architecture closely resembles the Greek models which inspired it. But there are several striking differences between typical Roman and Greek buildings. For one thing, the Romans used arches and domes in their buildings.

The arch had been used by the Egyptians, the Sumerians, and the Assyrians much earlier. It had also been employed by the Etruscans, from whom the Romans borrowed it. But the Romans

glorified it. They put arches over their doorways. They erected triumphal arches for their victorious Emperors. They combined arches with Greek columns, placing one row of columns above another, as you can see in the picture of the Colosseum.[1] The effect may be less simple than that of the Athenian Parthenon, but the combination of arch and column enabled Rome to construct buildings and bridges of immense size which would have been impossible and inconceivable to the Athenians.



Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

THE PANTHEON

Photograph of a model, showing how the Pantheon probably appeared when it was first built.

The Dome. — The dome, of course, is based on the same principle as the arch. It was used by the Romans to provide roofing for large public buildings. If the roof is supported simply by slabs of stone lying across the tops of columns, the columns must be close together, and the interior of the building cannot contain any very large unbroken space. If wood is used for the roof, one can get a longer span, but the roof may be destroyed by fire. The dome

[1] See the illustrations on pp. 339, 424; also pp. 308, 347, 368.

solved the difficulty. By making the dome of concrete, so that it hardened into one solid piece, Roman builders found it possible to roof very large buildings. The great dome of the Pantheon, built by Hadrian, is an impressive monument of Roman architecture, although the bronze covering has been stripped off. Justinian's church of Saint Sophia at Constantinople, with its huge dome supported by lofty arches, is still regarded as the most magnificent building of its kind in the Near East.[1]

Splendor of Imperial Rome. — The tourist in Rome can still see the marble ruins of the Roman Forum,[2] the crumbled imperial palaces on the nearby hill, and the huge shell of the Colosseum. But such remnants fail to show how splendid must have been the appearance of imperial Rome. One must imagine these and countless other buildings not as ruins, but as magnificent edifices sheathed in marble. One should see marble statues everywhere. One should wander through stately colonnades. One should catch the glint of the sun from the gilded dome of the Capitol.

Books and Education. — In literature, as in art, the Roman Peace bore abundant fruits. There was an immense output of books during the five centuries following Augustus. When we say books, we mean long strips of papyrus, rolled up in cylinder form. But sometimes sheets of sheepskin (parchment) were used instead of papyrus. When we remember that printing had not yet been invented, so that all books had to be written and copied by hand, the marvel is that there were so many of them.

The quantity of books produced during the existence of the Roman Empire was great because more people than in earlier times had leisure and education. Economic progress had created a larger class of wealthy families. The government gave employment to countless officials. The Roman courts provided an opportunity for swarms of lawyers to earn a living. The number of schools increased. Throughout the Empire there were elementary schools in the towns. The larger municipalities hired professors to teach young men rhetoric — the art of public speaking, composition, and argument. Wealthy families sent their sons to obtain what

[1] See illustration on p. 501
[2] See illustration on p. 308.

amounted to a University education at Rome or Athens, where there were large numbers of professors and students.

Latin and Greek. — It must not be supposed that Latin was the sole language of education and literature. Until the sixth century A.D. it was the official language of the government. It was the language of the people of Italy, and of the educated classes in the western provinces.

In Greece, Asia Minor, Syria, Egypt, and the other provinces, other languages prevailed. In Syria the masses used a Semitic language (Aramaic). In Egypt, the common people spoke the native Egyptian (Coptic) tongue. In all the eastern provinces, however, Greek was a sort of universal language in which fine literature and learned works of science were written. Even in the West, well-educated people understood Greek in addition to Latin. Accordingly, a great deal of the literature produced in the eastern part of the Roman Empire was in the Greek language, while some was in Aramaic, and some in other tongues; whereas the books produced in the West were in Latin.

Plutarch. — The few writers whom we mention here are chosen because their works illustrate the variety and range of the literature of the Roman Empire. Let us begin with Plutarch (46–120 A.D.). From his native Greece, Plutarch (plōō′tärk) went to Rome, where he joined the throng of Greek professors. It is said that he tutored Hadrian, the great pro-Greek Emperor, and that he was appointed governor of Greece. Plutarch's most famous work, his "Parallel Lives," is a series of biographies, most of which are arranged in pairs, one of each pair being a famous Greek, the other a famous Roman. Thus a Greek writer became the most celebrated biographer of the heroes of early Roman history and Greek and Roman traditions were set side by side.

Marcus Aurelius. — The same cosmopolitanism is shown in a different way by Marcus Aurelius, the philosophical Emperor of the second century.[1] Though his ancestry was probably Italian and Spanish, and his office was that of Roman Emperor, he wrote his celebrated "Meditations" in Greek. The moral principles which he set forth in his book were based on Stoicism, one of the

[1] See pp. 343–344.

chief Hellenistic philosophies, which had been accepted with some modifications by a good many members of the Roman ruling class.

Galen. — A contemporary of Marcus Aurelius was Galen (gā′lĕn), who was born at Pergamum in Asia Minor, spent part of his life at Rome, and returned to his native country. Galen wrote Greek books on logic, ethics, grammar, and other subjects. But his most famous works were on anatomy and medicine. His description of the structure of the human body, based partly on the work of earlier surgeons and partly on his own dissection of animals, became a standard treatise. While his knowledge of the bones, muscles, and nerves was quite detailed and fairly accurate, his theory of disease was more ingenious than scientific. The body, he said, contains four elements — hot, cold, wet, and dry.[1] If there is too much or too little of one, the body is diseased.

Ptolemy. — Let us study one more Greek writer. Claudius Ptolemy, a Greek-speaking native of Egypt, lived in the century of Galen and Marcus Aurelius — the second century A.D. His chief book, the "Almagest"[2] (ăl′mȧ-jĕst), was a summary of the astronomical knowledge of his age. The earth, he believed, was a sphere resting stationary in the center of a spherical heaven. The heavenly bodies move across the sky from east to west. With the aid of elaborate calculations, Ptolemy attempted to explain and describe the movements of sun, stars, and planets. In so doing, he gave a good summary of the science of trigonometry, which Hellenistic astronomers had developed. Ptolemy's conception of a spherical universe with the earth at the center prevailed in Europe until the sixteenth century.

A Roman Map

[1] Compare pp. 216–217.

[2] It was not the original title, but a name later applied to the book by the

Geography. — Ptolemy also wrote a remarkable book on "Geography" and drew a famous map of the world, which we may mention simply to remind ourselves that the expansion of Rome meant a useful increase of geographical knowledge. Southern Europe, northern Africa, and western Asia were fairly well charted. The British Isles and the western coasts of Europe, the mid-tropical part of Africa, southern Asia, and China were beginning to enter more definitely into the geographer's horizon, although they were rather badly drawn on Ptolemy's map.

Quintilian. — Turning now to the Latin authors of the imperial age, we discover that they were drawn from the Romanized provinces as well as from Italy. Two of the most eminent writers of the first century A.D. were Quintilian (kwĭn-tĭl′ĭ-ăn) and Seneca (sĕn′ē-kȧ), both of Spanish birth, and both attracted to Rome by the matchless opportunities offered by the capital.

Quintilian became the leading professor of rhetoric and oratory at Rome. The Emperor Vespasian endowed a professorship for him. The Emperor Domitian made him tutor to the heirs of the crown. His textbook of oratory (*Institutio Oratoria*), containing a review of literature and two essays on education, became a standard work. The fact that it summarized both Greek and Latin literature is typical of the blending process that was at work.

Seneca. — Seneca was the most prominent writer in what has been called the Silver Age of Latin literature — the period after the Golden Age of Augustus. He became a favorite at court. He was the tutor and later the adviser of the Emperor Nero. His wealth and influence were so great that even Nero grew jealous. In the end, Nero compelled him to commit suicide. Seneca's tragedies were rather pompous, and his scientific writings were amateurish. His essays on moral questions were more important, and probably more popular.

Pliny. — A third writer of the Silver Age was Pliny (plĭn′ĭ), who is usually known as Pliny the Elder to distinguish him from his nephew, who also became famous. Pliny, like Seneca, combined statesmanship with literature. His industry was proverbial. Not only did he spend much of the night in his study, but in spare moments which other men would have wasted he had books read

aloud to him, or he dictated to a secretary. His greatest work, entitled "Natural History," is really an encyclopedia of science and art. It includes geography, botany, zoölogy, agriculture, medicine, as well as painting and sculpture. In collecting facts for this work, he consulted two thousand books. The interesting point is that he mentions, as sources of his information, more than twice as many non-Latin as Latin books. Pliny provided in Latin a readable medley of Greek, Hellenistic, and Roman knowledge. It was less scientific in spirit than the best Hellenistic works. It seems to a modern reader a strange mixture of fact and fiction, because it contains so many absurdities along with so much scientific observation of nature. Scientific curiosity, it may be remarked, was fatal to the author. He was killed while attempting to obtain a close-up view of the great eruption of Vesuvius in 79 A.D. — the eruption that buried Pompeii and Herculaneum in ashes and molten lava.

Tacitus and Juvenal. — Tacitus (tăs′ĭ-tŭs) and Juvenal (jōō′vē-năl) belonged to a later generation. Both denounced the corruption and vices of Roman society. Tacitus (54–117 A.D.) preached his sermons in the form of history and biography. Dark and bloody is the picture he draws of Emperors such as Nero, and of the decay of Roman morality, patriotism, and manhood. In a book on Germany he contrasts the simple, manly virtues of the German barbarians with the luxury and immorality of the Roman upper classes. Probably he exaggerated both sides of the picture. The letters of Pliny the Younger, for instance, show us that not all Roman aristocrats were steeped in vice. Juvenal (60–140 A.D.) censured his fellow-countrymen in a different way. His "Satires" were sarcastic descriptions of the fads, the vices, the manners and morals — or lack of morals — of Roman society in the early part of the second century.

Decline of Classical Literature. — In the later centuries of the Empire, there were fewer important pagan writers. The classical pagan civilization had lost its vitality, as we see in the writing of the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries. New books were still being written in the Greek and Latin languages, and some of them were very remarkable books, masterpieces of literature. But

they were not classical, not pagan. The best and most vigorous writing was Christian.

As the rise of Christianity will be discussed in a later chapter, we cannot enter into detail here. We can only remind the reader that the history of literature and thought under the Roman Empire would be incomplete if one omitted the "New Testament," the brilliant and learned books of St. Augustine and the writings of many another "father" of Christianity.[1] The Greek and Latin literature of pagan antiquity blended into the Greek and Latin literature of the Christian civilization.[2]

Summary. — To summarize what has been said in the foregoing pages, the conquests made by the Roman armies resulted in a unification of the civilized Mediterranean world. The effect of the conquests on Rome was to undermine the old republican form of government, and substitute an imperial monarchy which became a military despotism. Meanwhile, business expanded throughout the Empire. Luxury and culture developed among the upper classes. The artistic, literary, economic, and scientific achievements of the hitherto disunited peoples around the Mediterranean were blended together. Western Europe became more civilized than in the past. Classical civilization, the ancient pagan civilization of the Mediterranean world, attained its greatest extent and prosperity during the first two centuries of the Roman Empire.

Decay of Classical Civilization. — Even at its climax, however, the classical civilization had certain fundamental weaknesses. (1) The attempt to establish a one-man government for the Empire worked badly; too often it produced oppressive despots rather than philosophical statesmen, and in the end it proved incapable of holding the Empire together. (2) The economic system of mass-production based on slavery seemed to produce brilliant results under Augustus, but on the whole it did not greatly improve methods of production nor did it apply scientific knowledge; nor could it silence the discontent of the working classes. In course of time production and trade suffered an alarming decline, while the yoke of compulsory labor, virtually serfdom, was fastened on the

[1] See pp. 427–428, 437.

[2] On the philosophy and religion of this period, see pp. 331, 343, 411–438.

masses. (3) Literature, science, philosophy, and the fine arts became more widespread, but they also declined during the later period of the Roman Empire. (4) The old religions, weakened by philosophical doubts, did not provide an adequate inspiration or a satisfactory moral guide, and multitudes were ready to embrace new religions. (5) The army, the mainstay of an imperial monarchy founded on military power, failed to attract civilized Romans, and was more and more recruited among barbarians, until it ceased to be a sure protection against barbarian invasions. In sum, the classical civilization of the ancient pagan world, having enjoyed a period of marvellous expansion and brilliance, seemed to become exhausted. One might almost compare it to a magnificent tree, with far-spreading branches and rich foliage, but with decay dangerously gnawing at the once mighty trunk.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. From what sources did the Roman Emperors obtain their great wealth, and for what purposes did they use it?
2. Explain why Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, and Nero were regarded in later ages as cruel tyrants.
3. What was the position of the Senate during the first century of the Roman Empire?
4. What part did the Prætorian Guard play in strengthening or in weakening the Roman monarchy?
5. Trace the steps by which the provinces and provincial armies gradually obtained a larger voice in the imperial government and finally dominated it.
6. Describe Stoicism and discuss its influence on the government and laws of the Roman Empire.
7. Why was civil war so frequent in the Roman Empire during the third century A.D.? What were the effects of the civil wars?
8. Discuss the reforms of Diocletian. Compare his policies with those of Augustus.
9. Explain the importance of the Mediterranean and of sea-power in the history of the Roman Empire.
10. How did the Roman conquests extend Roman civilization in Europe?
11. What boundaries of the Roman Empire were "natural frontiers"? Why did the Romans have particularly grave difficulties on their Asiatic frontier?

12. Discuss the meaning and the results of the Roman Peace.

13. Describe the government and administration of the Empire.

14. Show how Justinian's Corpus Juris Civilis marked the climax of the development of law in the Roman Empire.

15. Describe the conditions of labor in agriculture and industry during the Roman Empire's period of greatness. What were the "coloni"? The "collegia"?

16. How did Roman architects use and modify Hellenistic styles of architecture?

17. To what extent was Latin the language of the Roman Empire? Mention some of the writers who used the Greek language.

18. Discuss the development of literature in the Roman Empire. The development of science.

19. Discuss the decline of the Roman Empire.

SELECT TOPICS

Roman economic life. KNIGHT, *Economic History of Europe*, I, 55–84; T. FRANK, *History of Rome*, ch. xxi; SANDYS, *Companion to Latin Studies*, 409–420. See also last topic below.

Millionaires and spendthrifts. DAVIS, *Influence of Wealth in Imperial Rome*, 65–71, 152–193; FRIEDLÄNDER, *Roman Life*, II, 131–145.

Stoics and other philosophers. DURANT, *Story of Philosophy*, 107–115; TUCKER, *Life in the Roman World*, 406–415; SANDYS, *Companion to Latin Studies*, 702–711; HICKS, *Stoic and Epicurean*, 113–152.

Justinian's Code. CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY, II, ch. iii.

Roman roads and travel. FRIEDLÄNDER, *Roman Life*, I, 268–280, 280–322; DAVIS, *Influence of Wealth*, 97–105; SANDYS, *Companion to Latin Studies*, 421–435.

Government of provinces. GREENIDGE, *Roman Public Life*, chs. viii and xi; MUNRO, *Source Book of Roman History*, ch. xii; ARNOLD, *Roman System of Provincial Administration*, ch. iv; SANDYS, *Companion to Latin Studies*, 390–409.

Roman taxation. BOAK, *History of Rome*, 344–347; ARNOLD, *Roman System of Provincial Administration*, ch. vi.

Position of women. FRIEDLÄNDER, *Roman Life*, I, 228–267; FOWLER, *Social Life*, 135–167; TUCKER, *Life in the Roman World*, 289–313.

Roman science. SEDGWICK AND TYLER, *Short History of Science*, ch. vii; SANDYS, *Companion to Latin Studies*, 712–727; THORNDIKE, *History of Magic and Experimental Science*, I, 41–99 (Pliny), 117–181 (Galen), 182–199 (applied science).

The collegia and the workers. DILL, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, 251–286.

Terrorism. DILL, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, 1–57.

The army. TUCKER, *Life in the Roman World*, 338–360.

Beginnings of serfdom. FRANK, *Economic History of Rome*, ch. xxii.

Constantine's new capital. BURY, *Later Roman Empire*, I, 50–58; OMAN, *Byzantine Empire*, 1–30; GIBBON, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. xvii; CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY, I, ch. i.

Hadrian. BOTSFORD, *Source-Book of Ancient History*, 505–510; FRANK, *History of Rome*, 484–493.

Diocletian. BOTSFORD, *Source-Book of Ancient History*, 527–532, 537–539; FRANK, *History of Rome*, 553–561; GIBBON, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. xiii.

Nero. BOTSFORD, *Source-Book of Ancient History*, 482–484; FRANK, *History of Rome*, 430–440; FERRERO, *Characters and Events*, 103–141.

Daily life of an aristocrat. TUCKER, *Life in the Roman World*, 193–237.

Comparison between Roman and modern politics. ABBOTT, *Roman Politics*, 47–95, 138–163.

Economic causes of Rome's decline. FRANK, *History of Rome*, 565–574; W. S. DAVIS, *Influence of Wealth in Imperial Rome*, ch. viii; SIMKHOVITCH, *Toward the Understanding of Jesus*, 84–139; W. L. WESTERMANN, "The Economic Basis of the Decline of Ancient Culture," *Amer. Historical Review*, July, 1915; A. P. USHER, "Soil Fertility, Soil Exhaustion, and Their Historical Significance," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, May, 1923; KNIGHT, *Economic History of Europe*, 79–84; ROSTOVTZEFF, *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, ch. xii.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THE TEACHER

See Chapter X. Also T. MOMMSEN, *Provinces of the Roman Empire from Cæsar to Diocletian* (2 vols.). M. I. ROSTOVTZEFF, *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*. S. DILL, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*. E. GIBBON, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, I–III. CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY, I. L. FRIEDLÄNDER, *Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire*. C. P. SHERMAN, *Roman Law in the Modern World*. SIR J. P. MAHAFFY, *Silver Age of the Greek World*. T. R. GLOVER, *Life and Letters in the Fourth Century*. C. BAILEY (ed.), *Legacy of Rome*. M. P. CHARLESWORTH, *Trade-routes and Commerce of the Roman Empire*. J. B. BURY, *History of the Roman Empire from its Foundation to the Death of Marcus Aurelius*.

CONVENIENT SOURCE MATERIALS

BOTSFORD, *Source-Book of Ancient History*, 480–573. D. C. MUNRO, *Source Book of Roman History*, chs. xi, xii. J. B. MOYLE (trans.), *Institutes of Justinian*. W. S. DAVIS, *Readings in Ancient History*. SUETONIUS, *Lives of the Cæsars*. TACITUS, *Annals*.

PART IV

THE CLASSICAL AGE IN FARTHER ASIA

Introduction

If we have been able to follow the story of the Mediterranean lands for a thousand years or so with almost no reference to India and China, it is because these latter lands were so nearly isolated. The history of Farther Asia was not closely interwoven, in ancient times, with the history of the Mediterranean peoples. Yet it must be remembered that great civilizations flourished in China and in India (and in tropical America, too) as well as in Mesopotamia, Egypt, and southern Europe. In Chapter IV we carried the development of India and China down to about 600 B.C. It is now time to return to them. What was happening in these countries during the long period of ten centuries while the Persian Empire rose and fell, while Athens had her days of glory, while Alexander was conquering his little "world," and while Rome was building her empire?

In a general way, there is a striking similarity between the histories of China, India, and the Mediterranean world. In each of these three regions, great empires were established, within which civilization could broaden out and blossom. In each, masterpieces of art and intellect were produced that were to be regarded in later ages as "classics" of surpassing excellence, models to be copied by future generations.



Asia in Classical Times

CHAPTER XII

GREAT EMPIRES IN CHINA AND INDIA

Buddhism in India

India Disunited. — In the sixth century B.C. the region now known as India was by no means a united country. Politically it was divided into a large number of kingdoms, principalities, and aristocratic republics. In culture the descendants of the early Aryan invaders had not yet become thoroughly blended with the conquered dark-skinned, native peoples. Blending was hindered by the division of society into classes or castes the members of which could not intermarry.[1] A number of different languages were spoken by the lower classes in various parts of the country. Nevertheless the educated upper classes of priests (Brahmans) and nobles (Kshatryas) were familiar with a modified form of the old Aryan language (Sanskrit), and generally regarded the old Aryan sacred writings (the "Rig-Veda" and later writings) with religious reverence.[2]

Hindu Religion Questioned. — The old religion, known as Hinduism or Brahmanism, with its crude conceptions of god, its bloody sacrifices, and its pessimistic contempt for life, grew less and less satisfactory to many Hindus. Just as in Greece and Rome the growth of civilization led thoughtful persons to question old ideas. Some men tried to find salvation by becoming ascetics, that is, by devoting themselves to religious meditation and by denying themselves all luxuries and comforts. Some went so far as to half-starve themselves and inflicted all sorts of discomfort and pain upon their own bodies. Many reformers and "holy men" appeared, preaching new religious doctrines or new methods of attaining peace of soul.

[1] See p. 108. [2] See p. 104.

Gautama Buddha. — The most famous of all these religious leaders, and the only one we need to remember, was Prince Siddhatta Gautama (gô′tȧ-mȧ, 550–487 B.C.). As a young noble, the son of a "raja" (nobleman) in a little country on the slopes of the Himalayas, Gautama seemed to be destined to a life of pleasure and ease. The work of dark-skinned serfs in his father's rice-fields provided him with wealth; he had servants to do his bidding; he could spend his days riding about in his chariot, hunting, taking part in races, and gratifying every wish. Nevertheless, he had glimpses of the darker side of life. When he met a shrivelled, aged pauper, or a man afflicted with a terrible disease, or when he saw an unburied corpse, he was reminded that all men must suffer and sometime die.

STATUE OF BUDDHA

Made in India shortly after the Greek invasion and showing Greek influence. From *Cambridge History of India.*

While he was giving himself to these melancholy thoughts, so the story goes, he learned that his beautiful young wife had just given birth to a son, his first and only child. That evening there was a joyous dance to celebrate the event. Yet Gautama was uneasy. After the dancing was over, and the household had fallen asleep, he rose from his couch, quietly tiptoed to his wife's room for a last glimpse of their baby, and then stole out into the midsummer moonlight, to mount his horse and ride away. Like so many other Hindus of his time, he believed that peace of soul could be achieved only by becoming an ascetic. Clad in a beggar's rags, he listened humbly to all that the Brahman priests had to teach, but he was not satisfied. He denied himself comforts and even food, until his body was weak and shrivelled with fasting, but in vain.

Sitting, one day, under the cool shadow of a giant banyan tree, and thinking how he had given up wealth, home, love, and all the

pleasures of life, he suddenly saw things more clearly. Jubilantly he arose, and told his former friends that the truth had been revealed to him. Reverently they hailed him as the "Buddha" — the "enlightened one," the teacher of truth. Soon crowds flocked to hear his words. Up and down the Ganges Valley he and his disciples wandered, clad in yellow robes, begging their food, and spreading the new belief. So it was that Gautama, at the age of thirty-five, became a Buddha and began to preach a religion that in many different forms would soon sweep over most of India, and across the lofty Himalayas to Tibet and China, and across the seas to Ceylon, Japan, and the Malay isles.

Buddha's Doctrines. — Like other religious teachers of his time, Buddha conveyed his ideas by word of mouth (writing was probably not yet known in India), and his teachings were not written down until two or three generations after his death. But they were very carefully memorized by his disciples. The essence of his belief was summed up in the "Four Noble Truths": (1) that life is bound to be full of sorrow and pain; (2) that sorrow and pain come from our desires; (3) that sorrow can be escaped only by means of "Nirvana"; and (4) that Nirvana may be achieved through an "Eightfold Path" (right belief, right resolve, right speech, right behavior, right occupation, right effort, right contemplation, and right concentration).

The first two of these "Noble Truths" seem to be just another way of saying, as the Hellenistic Cynics and Græco-Roman Stoics said, that as long as we desire comfort, or health, or wealth, or any other joy, we are liable to disappointments and sorrows.[1] Buddha's Eightfold Path, if we could explain it here in detail, would show no small resemblance to Stoic philosophy. In it there was much that was wise and truly noble. He would have men aspire to avoid injuring others, to eradicate wrong, to curb their passions, and to overcome ignorance. It is more difficult, however, for readers brought up in Christian ways of thought to understand the "Nirvana" which Buddha promised his faithful followers.

Nirvana has been explained as the serenity, the untroubled calm of spirit, that will come when a person has completely killed all

[1] See pp. 238–240.

ambition, all ill-will, all craving for pleasure, all desire for future life, all desire even for present life, all pride, all ignorance, in his own heart and mind. If a person dies with unsatisfied desires, his craving causes the creation of a new body, and his personality is condemned to be born anew, for another round of sorrow and pain. If a man practised Buddhism perfectly and achieved Nirvana, he would not be reborn.

India in Touch with the Near East

Alexander's Invasion of India. — Two centuries after Buddha announced his Eightfold Path, India was invaded from the northwest. During those two centuries, the country remained disunited under petty Aryan (or perhaps we should now call them Hindu) princelings, and no striking advances were made in civilization, except the introduction of alphabetic writing, which was probably brought into India from the Near East by Arab traders. In the year 327 B.C., however, Alexander the Great, the Macedonian conqueror, crossed the Hindu Kush mountains and descended into India, with sunburned, battle-scarred veterans, whose spears had already laid Persia low. After fighting his way down the slopes of the mountains, he at length reached the Indus River. Early the next year his phalanx built a bridge of boats across the stream, and marched across it into the part of India known as the Punjab. Victory smiled on him, as always, yet he was compelled to turn back; his weary soldiers would go no farther. The lands west of the Indus he

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

Indian Buddha Showing Greek Influence

placed under Macedonian governors, and in the strip of conquered territory east of the river he left native princes as his viceroys. Then regretfully he sailed down the Indus to the sea, and while his fleet skirted the coast he led his army overland back into Persia. His brief invasion had touched only the northwestern fringe of India. Nevertheless, it had far-reaching effects. India was now in close contact with the Hellenistic world. Across the Indus into India came Hellenistic manufactures, art, and ideas. The practice of using stone in building came into vogue; statues were carved in stone; and Hellenistic religious beliefs filtered into India. In politics, too, Alexander's invasion left its mark on India, as we shall now explain.

The Maurya Empire. — One of the Indian princes who became acquainted with Alexander was Chandragupta Maurya (chăn-drȧ-gōōp′tȧ môr′ĭ-ȧ, 325–298 B.C.). Eager to emulate the Macedonian conqueror, this Maurya prince collected an army of warlike barbarians and made himself master of north-central India. One of Alexander's generals (Seleucus the Conqueror) indignantly hurried to crush this upstart. The Indian upstart, however, defeated the Macedonian, and thereby won for himself not only undisputed possession of the Indus, and of the mountains to the west of that river, but also a fair-skinned Macedonian wife, the daughter of Seleucus.

We need not follow in detail the later wars by which Chandragupta Maurya subdued most of the Ganges Valley and made himself Emperor of almost all northern India. His was the first great Indian Empire of which history tells. It was an autocratic Empire, held in subjection by an army of 9000 war elephants, 8000 chariots, 30,000 horsemen, and 600,000 foot soldiers, so the old record says, probably with a certain amount of exaggeration. The Emperor had an elaborate system of officials, to collect rent from the peasants, to take the census, maintain the irrigation canals, supervise the markets, control the liquor traffic, etc. On the Ganges was the capital city, defended by a wooden palisade and surrounded by a moat. In his royal palace, built of timber, but adorned with gilded pillars, the Emperor lived in barbaric splendor.

Asoka. — The chief importance of Chandragupta's career was that it provided the foundation on which his grandson, Asoka (*ȧ*-sō′k*ȧ*), could build. Asoka (273–232 B.C.) began his long reign in the accepted fashion of ancient despots, by undertaking a war of conquest against a neighboring kingdom. In an inscription which he ordered to be carved on stone, Asoka tells how horrified he was to discover that such a conquest "involves the slaughter, death, and carrying away captive of the people"; it meant killing 100,000 and enslaving 150,000. Thenceforth Asoka avoided war. Most of India, except the southern tip, was under his rule, and he made no further attempt to extend his dominion by the use of the sword. True conquest, he said, is spiritual, and for his spiritual conquests Asoka is chiefly remembered.

INDIAN SCULPTURE

A relief on the column erected by Asoka at Sarnath. From *Cambridge History of India*

He made himself the imperial patron of Buddhism (with modifications). He had public proclamations carved upon rocks in different parts of the Empire, urging his subjects to study Buddha's teachings, to follow the Law of Duty, to speak the truth, to obey father and mother, to show respect for all living animals, to cease hunting and slaughtering animals, to treat slaves kindly, and to give alms to the poor. He filled India with magnificent Buddhist monasteries and with statues of Buddha. He sent his brother and sister with a band of Buddhist missionaries to convert the islanders of Ceylon, and they succeeded, too. Ceylon is still largely Buddhist and owes the art of irrigation and of stone-carving to this Buddhist mission. Asoka likewise sent missionaries to Burma, another land that has remained Buddhist.

The missions which he sent to convert Persia, Egypt, and Greece

were less successful, but they are interesting to us as evidences of the intimate contact which had been established between India and the Hellenistic World. Such contact, we may point out, had a strong influence on Buddhism in India; increasingly the Buddhists converted Buddha's system of ethics into a religion which made statues of Buddha and worshipped him as divine, a religion with priests (or monks), and monasteries, and ritual, a religion which Egyptians and Greeks could have recognized as similar to their own cults. Even the statues of Buddha often showed traces of Greek artistic standards and of Græco-Egyptian conceptions of the gods. India was being drawn into the main stream of civilization, at the same time that she herself, by means of Buddhist missions, was drawing Ceylon and Burma, and other Asiatic countries after them, into her own channel.

An Indian Gateway of the Maurya Period

From *Cambridge History of India*

Decay of the Maurya Empire. — Asoka died full of years and of piety, leaving his Empire to be divided between two grandsons. About them and their successors we know little, and care little. Gradually the Empire crumbled away. Principalities established

by Hellenistic adventurers on the northwestern frontier extended their domination and their Hellenistic influence into northern India for a time, until they were swept away by barbarian invasions. For a time the Parthian Empire[1] held northwestern India. Then came more barbarians, and new dynasties ruling northern India.

Trade with the Roman Empire.—Sketched so briefly, the picture might seem desolate, if we did not hasten to add that during this period India was carrying on a flourishing trade with Egypt and Syria. In the first century B.C. over a hundred vessels a year sailed between Egypt and India. The number was increased in the next century, after a Greek sea-captain (Hippalus) discovered that by taking advantage of the monsoons (steady, seasonal winds) he could sail directly across the Arabian Sea from the Gulf of Aden to India, instead of slowly skirting the seacoast. In this way, one could leave Egypt in July, reach India by the end of September, start the return trip in November, and arrive at Alexandria in February. The large number of Roman coins that have been found in India may be regarded as one proof that during the next two centuries trade was very active. From India the Romans bought cotton goods, pearls, emeralds, diamonds, ivory, rice, pepper, and Chinese silks. To India they brought not only gold and silver coins, but also copper, tin, lead, coral, glass, wine, linen, trained boy singers, and slave girls.

The Gupta Dynasty and the Golden Age. — So the centuries passed, until in the fourth and fifth centuries A.D. a new dynasty of native Indian Emperors, the Gupta (goŏp'tȧ) dynasty, reunited a considerable part of Asoka's Empire, and gave India what is sometimes praised as a "Golden Age." Some of the finest Indian sculpture was done in this period; the frescoes painted by fifth-century artists are considered the best of Hindu art; learned men in India became familiar with Hellenistic sciences such as mathematics and astronomy; and famous poets penned immortal lines.

It is important to remark, however, that this flowering of culture was associated with a revival of the old Sanskrit language, as the language of literature, and by the restoration of the old Brahman religion of the Hindus. The Gupta Emperors were Hindus.

[1] See pp. 354–355.

Buddhism was no longer in favor with the government. Gradually, and very slowly, it lost favor among the people, and died out of India. At this very time it was winning remarkable triumphs in China, whither it had been carried about the year 67 A.D. Thanks to its hold on China, on Japan, on Central Asia, on Burma, and on Ceylon, Buddhism has remained one of the world's great religions; but in the land of its birth Buddhism is no more.

STONE-WORK IN INDIA OF THE MAURYA PERIOD

From *Cambridge History of India*

India's Dark Age. — The power of the Gupta Emperors was not enough to withstand a new series of barbarian invasions — by the Huns, who swept into India as well as into Europe. From about the sixth century A.D. to the fourteenth, India was a geographic expression, a great land broken up into petty kingdoms and torn by chronic wars. It was into such an India that Moslems came as conquerors in the fourteenth century.[1]

THE CONFUCIAN AGE IN CHINA

China's Isolation Effective but Not Complete. — China, like India, while not wholly isolated, was sufficiently cut off from the Mediterranean world so that ideas and inventions crossed the barrier of central Asia slowly, and sometimes not at all. For instance, the knowledge of iron reached China centuries after the

[1] See pp. 663–664, 731.

Hittites in Asia Minor were smelting iron for their neighbors; but after a time we find China sending pig iron to Rome. Again, stone statues were carved in Egypt for thousands of years before the art was carried over into India, and from India it made its way (perhaps not for the first time) into China along with Buddhism. On the other hand, the alphabet reached India late, and never reached China until it was too late for the Chinese to give up their own intricate and beautiful, but very difficult, system of monosyllabic characters. Only to a very small extent, in ancient times, did scientific, philosophical, and religious ideas cross the barriers of mountain and desert from the Mediterranean to the river valleys farther east. Yet the ideas taught by Buddha, as we have seen, were remarkably similar, in certain respects, to the beliefs of Græco-Roman philosophers, and, as we shall proceed to show, similar philosophies of life arose in China. In facing eternal problems, men are men, whether they live in the East or in the West. Kipling never said anything less true than "East is East and West is West, and never these twain shall meet." East and West have been meeting, and resembling each other, and influencing each other, all through history.

"The Old Philosopher," Lao Tzu. — If scholars who enjoy pointing out small differences rather than great similarities would not object, one might venture to say that Lao Tzu (lä′ŏ-tsû′), born 604 B.C., was the Gautama Buddha of China. Lao Tzu means "the Old Philosopher"; his real name was Li Erh. Like Gautama, Lao Tzu taught a "Path" or "Way" (Tao) of right living, but he taught it fifty years earlier. His message was fundamentally the same as the Buddhist idea and the Stoic idea that man can win happiness and contentment only by curbing his desires. "He is content who has enough," said Lao Tzu. "There is no fault greater than greed of gain." A man should not let passions and desires ruin the peace of his soul. "Horse-racing and hunting disorder the mind, and the scramble for wealth mars the character of man." In such matters as these, Lao Tzu might easily have found himself in agreement with Buddha in the next century, or with the Stoic Roman Emperor, Marcus Aurelius, seven centuries later.

If Lao Tzu was a shrewd philosopher in his day, he became more

than that in time. First he became a tradition, then a god. Seven hundred years after his death, a temple was built in which he was worshipped. Gradually his teachings were blended with worship of the old gods. Taoism (tou'ĭz'm), as the religion of his followers was called, became one of the great Chinese religions.

Confucius. — Though the fame of the Old Philosopher was great, still higher was the renown of a younger sage, born about fifty years later (551 B.C.). K'ung Fu Tzu (kōong'fōō-tsû', meaning "Kung the Philosopher") or Confucius (kŏn-fū'shĭ-ŭs), as we call him, was essentially a Chinese gentleman. Though he suffered poverty in his youth, he was the son of a gallant army officer who could trace his honorable ancestry back through many a generation of aristocracy. Like other Chinese gentlemen of the age, he enjoyed music, reading, archery, horses, dogs, hunting, and fishing. He was a stickler for good manners, and wrote what might be called a Chinese "Book of Etiquette" — rules for the life of a gentleman.

CONFUCIUS
A modern imaginary picture.

His teachings did much to develop in China a remarkable fondness for rather elaborate etiquette. Part of correct etiquette in his day was the practice of religious customs. As regards such matters, Confucius was decidedly conservative and conventional. He care-

fully performed all the customary religious devotions to the various gods or spirits of the household, and to his ancestors, and he honored the worship of Heaven and Earth. Respect for parents, he said, meant obeying them during their lifetime, arranging proper burial ceremonies for them at their death, and worshipping them after death. A good son does not change from his father's ways, at least for three years after his father's death.

Confucius, like Buddha, was more concerned with men than with gods or with spirits. Most of his sayings had little to do with religion; they were more in the nature of proverbs. "The cautious seldom err"; "Learning, undigested by thought, is labor lost; thought unassisted by learning, is perilous"; "To see the right and not do it, that is cowardice." Perhaps the most famous saying of Confucius is his Golden Rule: "What you do not like when done to yourself do not do to others."

About government, as well as about private conduct, Confucius had his ideas. Looking about him, he saw the dukes and other nobles who ruled over provinces or smaller districts living in luxury, oppressing the common people, quarrelling among each other, and waging destructive wars. Confucius believed such evils could be corrected if rulers would be the fathers of their people and govern with wisdom and righteousness, in accordance with the good old ways. Eager as he was to reform the government, he had no real opportunity until he was fifty-one years old, when the duke of Lu (now part of the province of Shantung) appointed him as governor of a city. In this modest post the philosopher was so successful that soon he was made minister of justice for the duchy of Lu, and it is said that he almost completely banished crime from the realm. He advised the duke to tear down the fortresses of unruly nobles. All went well until the duke of a neighboring state sent to the duke of Lu a gift of a hundred and twenty fine horses and eighty dancing girls; with the result that the duke of Lu lost interest in the sage advice of Confucius, and the philosopher resigned. After that, Confucius travelled to other duchies, everywhere receiving honor; but his hope of reforming the government of China, and of bringing to an end the wars among the Emperor's feudal vassals, was left unrealized.

It is not easy to sum up the influence of a teacher and reformer such as Confucius, but we may at least emphasize the following points: (1) As political reformer he failed, yet his rules for the conduct of government and his theory of the Emperor's supreme position as mediator between the nation and the forces of nature had great influence in later years. (2) His careful observance of ancient religious ceremonies became part of the tradition about him, and consequently his own fame became closely intertwined with the worship of ancestors and reverence for the old religion. (3) His rules of etiquette and his pithy proverbs on morality have been influential factors in molding Chinese character. (4) Finally, the conservative tendency already hinted at in the above statements was expressed most clearly in the Wu-King (Five Canons) — a sort of encyclopedia of literature, prepared by Confucius and his disciples, containing the legends and history, the poetry and the wisdom, of past ages. By this means he did more than preserve the learning and literature of the past; he gave to the China of the future her greatest classic. Ever since his day, the writings of Confucius have been admired and quoted by the Chinese.

End of the Chóu Dynasty. — In the time of Confucius, China consisted of several fairly large principalities, such as Ch'i, Ch'in, Chin, and Ch'u. Each of these was a mass of smaller states (duchies, counties, and baronies) united under a system known as feudalism. Under feudalism, the barons, counts, dukes, and other rulers of small states were supposed to be loyal to their respective princes or kings, and the latter were supposed to be loyal to the Emperor. As a matter of fact, however, the princes were continually waging wars among themselves. That was what feudalism really meant in China. Feudalism had existed many centuries, and it had grown worse as the centuries passed. It finally led to the overthrow of the Chóu dynasty, 249 B.C., by the ruler of one of the border duchies (Ch'in).

Shih Huang-ti, the Chandragupta of China. — After a long struggle among rival princes, one of them defeated all the others and assumed the title of Emperor (221 B.C.). He then adopted the name Shih Huang-ti (shĭ-hwäng-dē′) ("First Emperor"), by which he is known in history.

He was in truth an Emperor. He ended the feudal system. In place of dukes and counts, he substituted civil and military governors, appointed by himself and under his supervision, to administer the thirty-six provinces into which he redivided the Empire. His well-organized army extended his power south across the

A Section of the Great Wall of China

Yangtse River, thus adding four more provinces to the realm. Roads and canals were constructed, moreover, binding the Empire more closely together.

From this time forward, we may remark, Chinese settlers and Chinese civilization gradually made the "barbarian" lands south of the Yangtse an integral part of China. Against the "barbarian" nomads on the north, who were known as the Hsiung Nu (sĭ-ōōng-nōō'), he waged a highly successful war, and then, to prevent them

from harassing China in the future, he built the Great Wall, stretching from the sea to mountains of the upper course of the Hwang-ho (Yellow River). Though it was at first built only of earth,[1] such a wall was a real barrier to the raids of savage horsemen from the north. Doubtless it was an important factor in compelling the overflow of emigrating nomads from the highlands of Central Asia to seek an outlet toward the west, rather than toward China. In this way it may have had something to do with the barbarian invasions that swept into Europe.[2]

While in many respects Shih Huang-ti deserved the gratitude of his people, he was regarded with fear during his lifetime and with hatred ever after. Chinese traditions represent him as a bloody and cruel despot. His unpopularity was due partly to his attempt to stamp out Confucianism. He ordered that all the Confucian books and all the cherished literature of the past must be burned, with the exception of books on practical subjects such as agriculture and medicine. Hundreds of learned men who attempted to save their books were beheaded, and others were exiled. While Shih Huang-ti lived, few dared resist his ruthless measures; but on the news of his death (212 B.C.) uprisings occurred in one region after another and his sons were put to the sword.

China in Contact with India and the Near East

Confucian Culture under the Han Dynasty. — The wars that broke out among rivals for the imperial throne after the death of Shih Huang-ti were soon ended by an energetic adventurer of peasant stock, who became king of the state of Han, defeated his competitors, and made himself Emperor (206 B.C.). He and his descendants held the throne for more than four centuries (206 B.C. to 220 A.D.); together they are known as the Han dynasty, and they gave the Chinese Empire what might be called a "Golden Age," an age of territorial expansion, brilliant culture, and commercial prosperity.

The outburst of literary activity under the Han dynasty was

[1] Later dynasties extended it and the Ming dynasty in modern times rebuilt it as a stone wall.

[2] See p. 444.

partly due to the invention of paper and of the hair brush (Chinese words were painted on paper with a brush, rather than written with pen, pencil, or stylus). It was also due to the repeal of Shih Huang-ti's edict against ancient books. Manuscripts were now brought forth from their hiding places, and many copies were made. New books were written, too. The first Chinese dictionary was compiled, the first comprehensive Chinese history was written, and some of the finest poetry was composed.

One of the Han Emperors founded an academy for the study of classical Chinese literature, and instituted a system of competitive civil-service examinations. Henceforth, the officials were selected from the list of men who had passed the examinations on the classics. Learning, rather than birth, became the basis of official and social standing. The writings of Confucius and his followers were considered as sacred classics. Confucius, indeed, was worshipped in the colleges of the Empire, and the Emperor himself sacrificed an ox at the grave of the ancient sage. Confucianism became a part of the classical literary culture of China.

Wu-ti's Conquests and the Silk Route. — While they patronized Confucian culture, the early Han Emperors were actively expanding their realm. The name of Emperor Wu-ti (wōō-dē′) may be unfamiliar to American readers, but it probably deserves a place alongside those of Alexander the Great, Julius Cæsar, and Charlemagne. During his long reign (from 140 to 86 B.C.), Wu-ti reconquered the lands south of the Yangtse, and annexed a part of Korea, but his most important conquests were the ones that opened up the "silk route" to the west.

Ancient China had been hemmed in on the west by the vast Desert of Gobi and the bleak Plateau of Tibet. If any trade had made its way over or between these barriers in early times, it was certainly very little. China had been quite effectively isolated. Moreover, in the Desert of Gobi dwelt the fierce, wandering horsemen known to the Chinese as Hsiung Nu but to Europeans as Tartars or Turks.[1] Whenever there was a dry season in their homeland, the Hsiung Nu overflowed into neighboring countries, in search of fresh pastures and loot. It was to keep the

[1] See pp. 394, 454–457, 660 and map on p. 380.

Hsiung Nu out of China that Shih Huang-ti built the Great Wall. But when the Hsiung Nu found the wall blocking them on the south they turned westward, and conquered the semi-desert valley or basin of the Tarim River — the region known as Eastern Turkestan. As this conquest brought the Hsiung Nu around the western end of the Great Wall, into a position from which they could again raid China, the Chinese felt no small alarm.

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

A Chinese Statue

In bronze gilt, dating from about 480 A.D.

Just at this time Emperor Wu-ti ascended the throne. Looking about for help against the Hsiung Nu, he sent General Chang Ch'ien to travel far to the west in search of allies. General Chang started westward with a hundred men, only to be captured and held ten years by the Hsiung Nu, but as soon as he could escape he continued his journey, and passed beyond the mountain barrier into the Oxus Valley. Much to his disappointment, he failed to win allies for China. But his journey had important results. He brought back to China fast horses from Turkestan, and new plants such as the grapevine, and the welcome news that plentiful supplies of valuable jade could be procured in the west. Probably he brought back, too, alluring tales of strange civilized empires — India and Persia.

Chang's report must have filled Emperor Wu-ti with dreams of profitable commerce with these western lands, for only a few years

later we find Wu-ti sending great armies to oust the Hsiung Nu from the natural caravan route which ascends westward, through a mountain pass, into the Tarim Valley. Soon afterwards (114 B.C.) Chinese caravans began to wend their way along this route, and across the Tian Shan range by mountain passes, and on to Turkestan and Persia. From the Great Wall in the east to the Tian Shan mountain passes in the west, the Chinese built a chain of forts to protect this route. China's power was extended not only over the Tarim Basin, but across the Tian Shan Mountains to include Ferghana. (See map on page 380.)

The result of these conquests was not merely to add eastern Turkestan to the Chinese Empire, but also, and this is more important, to bring China into commercial and cultural contact with both India and the Near East. The Far East was no longer completely shut off from the rest of the world.

Chinese Trade with India and the Near East. — Over the newly won trade route several Chinese caravans, sometimes ten or more a year, carried bales of Chinese silk, and also bars of iron, to be exchanged for precious stones, jade, amber, coral, and glass. Apparently the Chinese merchants usually made this exchange not directly with the Greeks or Romans, but with the people of Turkestan or else with the Persians, who acted as middlemen and passed the Chinese goods on to the Near East, either overland across Persia and Mesopotamia, or down the Indus Valley to the sea and thence by ship to the Mediterranean.

The silk from China was taken to Syria, dyed purple and embroidered in gold thread, and sold by Syrian merchants to wealthy Greeks and Romans. It was becoming fashionable in Rome at the time of Augustus; Tiberius, the successor of Augustus, tried in vain to prohibit wealthy Romans from wearing the luxurious new fabric. Indeed, some Romans felt that too much Roman money was being sent east for Chinese silk.

Yet the trade continued, and grew, and apparently the Romans became eager to deal directly with the Chinese, instead of paying profits to Persian middlemen. Perhaps one reason for the Roman wars against the Parthian kings of Persia [1] was the hope of eliminat-

[1] See pp. 354–355.

ing middlemen's profits. Attempts were made to open up a direct sea route to China, and Chinese annals record the arrival of a Syrian vessel in the year 166 A.D., but it was too long a voyage to become popular. Occasionally, too, travellers and envoys from the Roman Empire ventured to make the long overland journey across Central Asia. Nevertheless, the distance was so great that on the whole the trade between Rome and China continued to be carried on through middlemen — through Persia and India. And perhaps that is the reason why the two great Empires of Rome and China did not have more influence upon each other. The secret of making silk, so eagerly desired by the Romans, was not brought from China until the last really Roman Emperor, Justinian, sent two monks to China. They returned, about the year 551 A.D., with some silkworm eggs in a hollow cane — eggs worth much more than their weight in gold, because they meant the beginning of the silk industry in Asia Minor and Europe.

Buddhism and Indian Influence on China. — China's contact with India was more direct and more vital in its effects. From India Buddhism was carried to China in the first century A.D., perhaps by merchants who had been visiting India on business, or perhaps in the more dramatic way described by Chinese annals. The Chinese version of the event is that the Chinese Emperor Ming-ti dreamed of a golden image, and on being advised that his dream was a divine command to send an embassy, dispatched ambassadors to India, whence they returned with a white pack-horse bearing images of Buddha and copies of the Buddhist sacred writings. At any rate, about the year 67 A.D. the Chinese Emperor established a Buddhist monastery at his capital, and had the Buddhist scriptures translated into Chinese, and made Buddhism a part of the state religion.

For centuries Buddhism remained a more or less foreign religion; its priests were missionaries from India, and to India fervent Chinese Buddhist converts went as pilgrims to visit the holy land of their faith. Gradually, however, Buddhism was fitted into Chinese ways and customs, blending with other Chinese beliefs and spreading far and wide, until it became more or less a part of the religion of the bulk of the people.

The spread of Buddhism in China had interesting effects on art and architecture. Buddhism filled the land with monasteries and beautiful pagodas (temples); it stimulated landscape-gardening; and in particular it was responsible for a remarkable development of sculpture and painting. In making Buddhist images the Chinese took over some of the Hellenistic artistic traditions that had been borrowed by India, and Chinese artists modified these traditions in their own way to produce an art that is different from the art of India, even though in some respects it reminds one of it. Most of the beautiful Chinese statues, in bronze, in pottery, or in stone, that you will see in our museums to-day, date from after the introduction of Buddhism.

Spread of Chinese Culture to Korea and Japan. — Another effect of Buddhism was the spread of Chinese civilization, through Buddhist missions, to Korea, Japan, Tibet, Mongolia, and Annam. Chinese Buddhism was introduced into Japan, probably through Korea, in the sixth century A.D., and the Buddhist missionaries sent back to China for skilled Chinese workmen to build temples and set up statues in Japan. The result was that the Japanese borrowed styles of architecture and sculpture, and the art of painting, and the Chinese system of writing. Though for a time there was an almost irresistible impulse to admire and imitate everything Chinese, from philosophy and literature to dances and instruments of warfare, the Japanese showed a remarkable ability in modifying and adapting Chinese arts to their own tastes and needs. They were not mere imitators. In the matter of writing, for example, they at first borrowed the Chinese ideograms (written characters representing words), but they simplified the Chinese characters and fitted them to the syllables of the Japanese language.

Decline of the Han Dynasty in China. — While these events were occurring, China herself was going through unfortunate political experiences. Weak emperors, conspiracies on the part of generals, officials, and empresses eager to seize the throne, assassinations and usurpations paralyzed the government of China in somewhat the same way that similar conspiracies weakened the Roman Empire. The Han dynasty of Emperors came to an inglorious end (220 A.D.), and after that China was broken up into

three kingdoms. Civil wars became chronic; barbarian adventurers set themselves up as rulers of the northern provinces, and the northern half of the Empire seemed practically lost; the capital was moved southward to Nanking on the Yangtse.

Yet for the common people life must have gone on much as usual, and Chinese civilization remained vigorous even though the government was weak. It was during this dark age, from the

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

A Chinese Painting

"Ladies with fans," painted about 800 A.D., during the Tang Dynasty.

third to the sixth century A.D., that Chinese culture was spreading, as we have seen, into Korea and Japan. It was in the fifth century that Chinese sailors first began to use the magnetic needle as a compass to guide their ships on long voyages to the Malay archipelago, to Ceylon and India, and even to the Persian Gulf. And the remarkable revival of the Empire in the seventh century, under the Tang dynasty, gave proof of the nation's vitality.

The Tang Revival. — The period of the Tang dynasty (608–907 A.D.) is regarded as a second great age in the history of the

Chinese Empire. Vigorous Emperors reconquered the territories that had been lost, and pushed the frontier even farther than before, until it reached as far west as the Caspian Sea; on the north, far beyond the Great Wall, it included Korea, part of Manchuria and part of the Gobi Desert; while on the south the Plateau of Tibet and part of the Indo-Chinese Peninsula were brought under Chinese domination and influence.

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

DECORATION ON A BRONZE MIRROR

An example of Chinese art during the Tang Dynasty.

Ambassadors from Persia, from the Græco-Roman Emperor at Constantinople, and from Mohammed,[1] visited the court of the great Oriental sovereign. Arab traders came in their ships to buy silks, while other foreign merchants met Chinese caravans in Central Asia to exchange wares. The Tang Period was not only prosperous; it was a Golden Age of painting, poetry, and sculpture. The older, classic literature was still cherished, and in fact a new edition of the classics was prepared under the patronage of one of the Tang Emperors; but in addition new and original work was achieved. Some of the finest poetry in the language and many of the most beautiful paintings, vases, and statues were produced during the brilliant seventh and eighth centuries A.D.

The Chinese Invention of Printing. — Although occasionally pictures and prayers had been printed from wooden blocks as early as the first century B.C., most Chinese books continued to be written, throughout the period of the Han and Tang dynasties, by

[1] See pp. 473–476.

hand, with a fine hair brush. A set of the classics was painted on stone tablets for preservation, but usually books were written on paper made of silk or cotton.

The art of printing books on paper from wooden blocks was employed on a large scale for the first time in the tenth century, when at the order of the Emperor a new edition of the Confucian classics and two voluminous encyclopedias were prepared. The process of printing was really a form of engraving. A page (really a double page, or two pages) of the book was first written on paper, and the paper was pasted face down on a block of wood. Then an engraver with a sharp tool pared the wood away everywhere except under the written characters, so as to leave the latter standing out in relief. By inking this block and pressing it on a clean sheet of paper, the printer could strike off a double page quickly and easily, and many copies could be printed from the original engraved block.[1]

If there had been close contact between China and Europe, the art of printing might have been communicated to the West in the tenth or eleventh century. As it was, Europe had to wait until the fifteenth century for this epoch-making invention.[2]

The Decay of Classical Civilizations

The Great Civilizations of Antiquity. — In these twelve chapters, covering the longest part of man's history, we have seen the big-game hunters of the Old Stone Age learning one after another the fundamental arts of civilized life; we have seen their descendants of the New Stone Age establishing agricultural villages; entering the Copper and Bronze Age, we have seen powerful civilized kingdoms arising; and passing into the Age of Iron and of Horses, we have seen still more remarkable civilizations developing, while greater empires rose and fell and rose again.

Not all peoples, nor all of the interesting civilizations have been

[1] The Chinese later invented what we call movable type, each block or type bearing a single character, but as China had no alphabet, a different type was required for each word, and the system of movable type was not so convenient as for alphabetic languages like our own.

[2] See pp. 777–781.

included in our survey. Very little has been said, for instance, regarding the peoples of northern Europe, the American Indians north of Mexico, or the Negroes of Africa. This is because their culture was less advanced and their influence less notable, in this ancient period, than the culture and influence of what might be termed the great ancient civilizations.

The civilizations of Egypt, of Babylon and Assyria, of Crete and the Ægean, of the Mayas, of the Græco-Roman world, of the Chinese, and of India stand out in the foreground of ancient history, because in most cases they gave birth not merely to great political empires, but to more lasting and more important results in industry, trade, art, literature, religion, and philosophy.

Weaknesses of Ancient Classical Civilizations. — 1. *Economic Conditions.* — Brilliant as were their achievements in art, literature, and philosophy, the classical civilizations of antiquity were built on an unsound economic foundation — the overworking of the common people. As manufacturing was done by hand, and as agriculture was carried on by crude and laborious methods, the bulk of the population in all these ancient empires had to spend its days in arduous manual labor, in order to make the barest living and at the same time to support the luxury of the upper classes. The masses existed for the benefit of the classes. In some form or other, slavery or serfdom was a feature of most ancient civilizations.

2. *Corruption of the Upper Classes.* — The exploitation of the masses often went hand in hand with the development of extreme luxury, extravagance, and immorality on the part of the ruling classes. This was certainly true in the case of Rome. When Rome became mistress of the world, the fabulous fortunes acquired by her ruling classes led to ostentation, self-indulgence, effeminacy, and vice. The aristocracy was almost literally suffocated by greater wealth than it knew how to use.

3. *Failure of Imperial Government.* — A third weakness of ancient empires was the political weakness inherent in despotism. The empires of antiquity were generally autocratic empires, absolute monarchies. One-man government proved to be good government when the one man happened to be a wise and benevolent statesman like Asoka, Augustus, or Hadrian. It produced successful wars

of conquest when the one man happened to be an able general such as Trajan, Cyrus, Thutmose, or Wu-ti. But it produced misgovernment, oppression, and disorder when the one man happened to be lacking in ability; and that happened very often. In the absence of representative and federal forms of government, the efficiency with which the provinces of a large empire were governed depended on the vigor and wisdom of the one man whose will was law.

Moreover, one-man government meant frequent conspiracies on the part of ambitious schemers and victorious generals eager to wrest the scepter from feeble hands. The chronic plots, assassinations, usurpations, and civil wars that marred the history of the Roman Empire were equally characteristic of the one-man governments of Egypt, Assyria, Persia, China, and India. In other words, ancient autocracies never solved the essential problem — how to select the one man to conduct the government.

The interesting attempts to develop democratic governments in city-states such as Athens and early Rome (before her expansion) met with failure in both cases largely on account of imperial expansion and foreign wars. Democracy could not live in a world of militaristic empires.

4. *Failure of Defense against Barbarians.* — It is a striking fact that so many of the great ancient empires, after periods of astonishingly vigorous military expansion, seemed to lose their vigor and became incapable of defending themselves. Egypt fell victim, successively, to the Assyrians, Persians, Macedonians, Romans, Arabs, and Turks. Assyria fell before the less civilized Persians. Persia succumbed to Alexander. The Roman Empire, as we shall soon see, was overrun by Germanic invasions. China yielded to Mongol barbarians. India was conquered by Mongols and later by Arabs. The best explanation we can offer is that the growth of wealth and luxury in ancient empires, sapping the manhood of the upper classes, corrupting the government and increasing the frequency of palace conspiracies, made the ruling classes less capable of defending their country, while at the same time the working classes, being ground down by economic exploitation, were less interested in defending their masters. In Rome, in

Carthage, and in Egypt we can see very notable examples of how such empires resorted to hiring barbarians to do their fighting, and in the long run became unable to defend themselves. And in the case of the Roman Empire there is evidence to indicate that at least in some cases the people in the provinces, groaning under heavy taxes, actually welcomed invaders who would end Roman oppression.

5. *Inferior Position of Women.* — One of the factors that weakened society in the ancient empires was the way in which women were regarded. Though women occasionally became rulers (in Egypt and in China at least), and though there can be no doubt that in many homes the wife was loved and respected, it is nevertheless safe to say that in general the position of women was very much lower than it is to-day. The women of conquered peoples were very often sold as slaves and became the property of the men who bought them. In Greece, in Egypt, and fairly generally in Asia, monarchs and men of the wealthier class had a number of wives and concubines, and kept them more or less secluded in the harem, instead of allowing them to mingle freely in society. In the case of monarchs, this practice of polygamy was a source of weakness to the government. There are numerous cases on record of monarchs becoming too much concerned with keeping peace among their wives, and of wives conspiring against each other to put their respective sons on the throne. And in the case of society at large, the degradation of women meant a weakening of the fundamental social institution — the family.

6. *Bondage to the Past.* — Another factor worthy of attention is the tendency of great civilizations in ancient history to become absorbed in the worship of the past. After periods of original and constructive achievements, in which masterpieces of art and literature were produced and methods of government or of industry improved, there seemed to be a tendency for later generations to be so lost in admiration for these masterpieces and methods that no energy was left for further improvement and originality. In Egypt, for example, after the great age of Egyptian sculpture, later artists to a large extent devoted themselves to making inferior imitations of the ancient classics. So in the Roman Empire the

Golden Age of Augustus was followed by a period in which writers tried to imitate the style of dead masters. The same tendency was at work in China and India. When "classics" are too slavishly admired and copied, at the sacrifice of originality, the present falls under the bondage of the past.

Paganism and the Decline of Classical Civilizations. — Finally, the suggestion may be offered that paganism[1] had something to do with the above-mentioned weaknesses of classical civilizations of antiquity. In the Roman Empire, toward the end, faith in the old gods grew weak, and the upper class of educated men adopted Stoic philosophy, or assumed an attitude of skeptical disbelief. In India Gautama Buddha taught an Eightfold Path of escape from desire and from life. The moral maxims of Confucius provided a guide to ethical life. But the teachings of the Stoics, of Buddha, and of Confucius were not enough for the common people; the masses, whether in the Roman Empire, in India, or in China, satisfied their religious instincts by means of temples and pagodas, idols and incense, magic and mysterious incantations. Such religions did not seem to provide either the moral guidance or the spiritual energy needed for continuing human progress. If the Græco-Roman world had remained pagan, perhaps its medieval history would have been more like that of Asiatic nations, and perhaps our own civilization would be more like that of China or of India. But into the Near East there came a new force, spreading through Europe and from Europe across the seas, and giving a new direction to world history. That new force made so profound a change in the development of civilization that its entry into history may appropriately be regarded as marking the end of the ancient world and the beginning of a new.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Describe the life and teachings of Gautama Buddha.
2. What effect did Buddhism have on the culture of India? Of China? Of Japan?

---

[1] Paganism means a religion which recognizes the existence of several gods, instead of one God. It embraces practically all religions other than Judaism, Christianity, and Islam.

3. What were the results of the invasion of India by Alexander the Great?

4. Compare the Maurya Empire with the Roman Empire as regards dates, extent, duration, and culture.

5. Describe the reign of Asoka. What was its significance in the history of civilization in Asia?

6. How did Hinduism regain its hold on India?

7. What commercial and other contacts did India have with the Near East? With China?

8. Compare the teachings and the lives of Plato, Gautama, and Confucius.

9. How did Shih Huang-ti endeavor to unite China? Why did he combat Confucianism? Which proved to be the stronger: the monarchy or the philosophy?

10. How did trade cross the desert-and-mountain barrier of Central Asia? In what way does the fact that such trade existed help to explain the westward expansion of the Chinese Empire? What were the chief commodities carried by the overland route?

11. How did China come into contact with India? Which country was more vitally affected by contact with the other?

12. To what areas did the influence of Chinese civilization spread during the Han and following dynasties, through the Tang Dynasty?

13. For what reasons was the period of the Tang Dynasty noteworthy?

14. What part did the barbarians of Central Asia play in the history of China and India?

15. Among the great civilized states which have been studied in our survey of ancient history, which were despotic monarchies, and which were republics? Is it possible to draw any conclusion as to which form of government was better suited for territorial expansion? For the progress of civilization? What were the weaknesses of monarchies? Of republics?

16. What were the fundamental economic differences between the classical civilizations of antiquity and the modern civilization in which we live?

SPECIAL TOPICS

Gautama Buddha. Smith, *Oxford History of India*, 48–56.

Alexander in India. Bury, *History of Greece*, 798–814; Smith, *Oxford History of India*, 58–67; Cambridge History of India, I, ch. xv.

India under Chandragupta. Smith, *Oxford History of India*, 72–92; Cambridge History of India, I, ch. xviii.

Asoka. Smith, *Oxford History of India*, 93–116; Cambridge History of India, I, ch. xx.

Buddhism in China. Williams, *China Yesterday and Today*, 289–315.

Feudal age in China. GRIFFIS, *China's Story*, 69–81.

Confucius. HIRTH, *Ancient History of China*, 237–257; WILLIAMS, *China Yesterday and Today*, 223–248; GOWEN and HALL, *Outline History of China*, 72–78.

Mencius. HIRTH, *Ancient History of China*, 282–295; GOWEN and HALL, *Outline History of China*, 78–81.

Taoism. WILLIAMS, *China Yesterday and Today*, 316–338.

Shih Huang-ti. GOWEN and HALL, *Outline History of China*, 84–92.

The Tang dynasty. GRIFFIS, *China's Story*, 121–134; GOWEN and HALL, *Outline History of China*, 116–130.

The Han dynasty. GOWEN and HALL, *Outline History of China*, 93–106.

Japan under Chinese influence. LATOURETTE, *Development of Japan*, 21–47; LONGFORD, *Japan*, 45–59.

The Shogunate in Japan. LATOURETTE, *Development of Japan*, 49–66; LONGFORD, *Japan*, 81–98.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THE TEACHER

H. H. GOWEN and J. W. HALL, *Outline History of China*. H. H. GOWEN, *Asia, A Short History*, chs. iii–iv. J. MCGOWAN, *Imperial History of China*. H. A. GILES, *Chinese Literature*. W. E. GEIL, *The Great Wall of China*. E. H. PARKER, *Ancient China*. R. K. DOUGLAS, *Confucianism and Taoism*. E. T. WILLIAMS, *China Yesterday and Today*. K. S. LATOURETTE, *Development of Japan*. F. BRINKLEY, *A History of the Japanese People*. V. A. SMITH, *Oxford History of India*. E. J. RAPSON (ed.), *Cambridge History of India*. T. F. CARTER, *The Invention of Printing in China and its Spread Westward*. J. H. LONGFORD, *Japan*.

CONVENIENT SOURCES

J. LEGGE, *Chinese Classics* (7 vols.).

PART V

THE TRANSITION FROM CLASSICAL TO CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION

Introduction

At the very time when the classical civilization of the Greeks and Romans was flourishing in the Mediterranean world under the rule of Augustus, and at the very time when in the Far East the Han dynasty was consolidating the Chinese Empire, there appeared in western Asia a new religion. Neither Augustus nor the Han Emperor knew it at the time, but this new religion was destined to transform the ancient civilization of Greece and Rome, and expand it throughout Europe, and in time to have important effects upon China and upon the entire world.

This new religion, Christianity, spread rapidly. Within four centuries it had become the prevailing religion in the Roman Empire. It exerted a profound influence on social institutions, and on art and literature. Indeed, it is hardly an exaggeration to say that the combination of Christianity with classical civilization produced a Christian-Roman civilization within the Empire.

From outside the imperial frontiers, however, came wave upon wave of barbarian invasions which shattered the Empire and threatened to blot out its civilization. Industry and trade received a terrific setback. Many cities withered away. Art and literature declined. In a word, Western Europe was to a large extent barbarized and went through a dismal "Dark Age" before the barbarians were converted to Christianity and civilized. The way was being prepared, however, even during the Dark Age, for the future upbuilding of a new and brilliant civilization in Western Europe. And meanwhile the Byzantine Empire, which was but a fragment of the former Roman Empire, kept some semblance of older civilization alive in the Near East.

CHAPTER XIII

CHRISTIANITY IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE

The Mission of Jesus

Conditions in Judæa. — Christianity began with the advent of Jesus of Nazareth in Judæa (jōō-dē′ȧ), a province of the Roman Empire on the eastern rim of the Mediterranean. Judæa was a part of the ancient Palestine, the home of the Hebrew people and of the monotheistic Jewish religion.[1] It had been conquered in turn by the Egyptians, the Babylonians, the Persians, the Greeks, and the Romans. In the time of Jesus it still preserved some appearance of self-government. It had a native king, named Herod, and a religious organization of its own under a high-priest and a council (*Sanhedrin*). But it was really dominated by a Roman governor — Pontius Pilate — sent out from Rome and backed by Roman legions. The Jewish inhabitants of the province were longing for some national leader who would free them from foreign rule.

Jesus of Nazareth. — Jesus was born in a stable in the little village of Bethlehem and spent the greater part of his life in very humble surroundings in another little Jewish village, the village of Nazareth. At thirty years of age he appeared in public, and after a short period of travelling, preaching, and teaching, he was arrested by officials of the Jewish high-priest and Herod on a charge of violating their religion, was found guilty by the Sanhedrin, and was then denounced to the Roman governor on a charge of seeking to make himself the King of the Jews and thus to undermine Roman authority. By Pontius Pilate and on the urgent entreaty of Jews, Jesus was condemned to death. He was crucified, along with two thieves, on a hill overlooking Jerusalem on

[1] See pp. 80–81.

the Friday in the week of the Jewish feast of the Passover, about the year 29 A.D.

His Teaching. — Jesus, while conforming to Judaism (the Jewish religion) himself, emphasized the ethical side of religion and gave new meanings to old precepts and practices. He insisted that, next to the duty of loving and serving God, man's supreme duty is to love his fellow men as he would love himself. In the Golden Rule ("do unto others as you would have them do unto you") and in the brief prayer beginning "Our Father," he summed up his ideas of the relation of man to man and of man to God.

He asserted that he was the Messiah (the Saviour) and the King (the Christ) promised to the Jews by their ancient prophets. But in this, he disappointed the Jewish leaders of his day. They expected a Messiah and a King who would come in glory as an earthly potentate and reëstablish their national independence. Jesus said quite bluntly that the kingdom which he had come to establish was not of this world, that it was the kingdom of heaven, and that it existed in the heart of every man who would repent of his sins and do the will of God.

When such statements are recalled and when likewise it is remembered that Jesus severely criticized the formalism and "hardness of heart" of the Jewish leaders, that he showed a disregard if not a contempt for political questions, and that he spoke as "one having authority," as one greater than the prophets, it is easy to understand why most of his fellow countrymen were scandalized by him, why they accused him of blasphemy, and why they besought the Roman governor to put him to death.

His Personality. — Jesus, like most Jewish young men of his time, had been carefully trained in the sacred scriptures of his people — the Old Testament — but otherwise he had no special education. He had no extensive learning. Nor did he belong to any aristocratic class. He had no wealth, no impressive family, no important social standing. He was distinctly one of the common people, working with his hands and travelling afoot or by donkey. Yet there was something about him which separated him from the common people of his day and from all people of all times. This

something was not race or class or money or schooling; it was unique personality.

His personality was marvellously lovable. He was peculiarly fond of flowers and children and human friendships. And while he preached a gospel of "great joy" and proved himself a welcome guest at wedding feasts and a happy visitor in many a home, his heart was touched by the sight of poverty or suffering. "He went about doing good." He did not scorn to associate with outcasts who were condemned and rejected by respectable and self-righteous people. Even the most repulsive forms of disease and sin drew from him only loving aid. It was told that he cured insanity, that he caused the bedridden to walk, that he restored sight to the blind and hearing to the deaf and speech to the dumb, and that he gave to the dead renewal of life. It is not to be wondered at that Jesus during his brief public career secured a small but devoted following among the Hebrews of Judæa.

CHRIST AS THE GOOD SHEPHERD

An early representation on Christian tombs in the Roman catacombs.

Apparent Failure. — It required a very great personality to preach the gospel which Jesus preached, but his mission in general might be described as a failure, as a mere episode in the history of the human race, if it had stopped short with the crucifixion on that fateful Friday in the Spring of A.D. 29. It was obvious that he had failed to reform Judaism. It was equally obvious that his followers were dismayed and scattered; some of them had lost faith in him. Not a scrap of writing had he left, and only the barest indication of what his disciples should do after he was gone. To Pontius Pilate, the Roman governor, the whole thing must have seemed a trivial religious affair among a despised people in

an insignificant corner of the huge and powerful Empire of the Caesars. With the crucifixion the affair would probably soon be forgotten. But the crucifixion did not put an end to the matter, nor was it soon forgotten.

The Resurrection. — According to the narrative in the Christian gospels, on the Sunday after the crucifixion — the first Easter Sunday — Jesus rose from the dead and appeared to some of his disciples, and during the next forty days he appeared and reappeared to them and to others, until at length he "was taken up into heaven." This resurrection, or rising from the dead, as recorded by early Christian writings, was regarded by the disciples of Jesus as evidence of divine power. Jesus of Nazareth was not only a great prophet, the promised Messiah and Christ, they proclaimed; he must indeed be the Son of God. His disciples had faith that he had died on the Cross to save all human beings from sin and eternal death, and had risen on the third day and ascended into heaven to prove that he was divine. The resurrection was for them the decisive event which turned defeat into victory, which inspired them with new faith and courage, and which led directly to the perfecting of an organization which should continue his work.

The Apostles. — The foundations of such an organization had already been laid by Jesus himself. Early in his public career he had "called" twelve humble men — most of them fishermen — to be his chief friends and confidants, his apostles, and he had commissioned them to preach and teach. Besides, Jesus had promised that after his departure he would send the Holy Ghost — the Spirit of God — upon his apostles to instruct them further and to abide with them forever.

Missionary Activity. — Immediately after the resurrection and ascension of Jesus, a group of his followers proceeded to choose a new apostle to take the place of Judas, who had proved faithless to the Master and was dead. A few days later, when the faithful were assembled to celebrate the Jewish feast of Pentecost, they felt that they were receiving the Holy Ghost, as had been promised. Thenceforth these Christians were fired with devotion and enthusiasm. They preached to the Jews in Jerusalem and throughout

Judæa. Soon they were carrying their message to Jewish colonies in Asia Minor and in Egypt. They made numerous converts.

Christianity in Judæa. — For a time the early Christian Church confined its labors to Jews. All the apostles and all their first converts were Jews; the main Christian church was at Jerusalem. Many Jewish customs were retained, and attempts were made to reconcile the teachings of Jesus with the laws of Moses. Some converts were made, but most of the orthodox Jews, under the leadership of their high-priests and King Herod, were as hostile to the Christian Jews as they had been to Jesus. The Christians were forbidden to preach or to perform their services; they were repeatedly imprisoned and otherwise persecuted; some of them were put to death.

The Preaching of Paul

Paul's Early Life. — Paul (or Saul, as he was first named) was born a Roman citizen at the town of Tarsus in Cilicia (the southernmost part of Asia Minor) during the lifetime of Jesus. His family were tentmakers. He was educated both in the Jewish scriptures and in the classical literature of the Greeks and Romans. Coming from a very religious family of Jews, he went to Jerusalem as a youth to study to become a rabbi. Whether he saw Jesus there we do not know. We do know that he denounced the claims of Jesus and joined in the persecution of the Christians.

Paul's Conversion. — Fired with persecuting zeal, Paul was on his way to Damascus, when he is said to have had a vision of Jesus as the risen Christ. At once he became convinced of the truth of the new faith and was baptized. Thenceforth he was the foremost advocate and missionary of the religion which he had formerly hated and persecuted. Paul began his preaching of Christianity in the synagogues of Damascus, and then, after a sojourn in Arabia, he returned to Jerusalem for the purpose of making the personal acquaintance of Peter, the chief of the original Christian apostles, presumably to hear at first hand about the earthly ministry and teaching of Jesus. For the next ten or twelve years Paul labored mainly to convert Jews in Syria and Cilicia. In these efforts he was only partially successful.

The Jews resisted him, and several times he was publicly whipped in their synagogues.

Paul among the Gentiles. — Then Paul turned to the Gentiles, that is, to nationalities other than the Jews; and from Greek-speaking pagans he received more converts to Christianity than from his own Hebrew-speaking people. Especially in the important city of Antioch was he successful in founding a church which embraced some Jews and more Gentiles.[1] With Antioch as his headquarters, he reached out farther and farther into the Roman Empire in search of converts. With little bands of co-workers he made several extensive journeys. He preached and made converts in Galatia, in Cyprus, in Macedonia, at Salonica, Athens, Corinth, and Ephesus. It was no easy thing to travel so extensively in those days. Paul was repeatedly shipwrecked and beset by robbers. He suffered illness and fatigue and want of food. He experienced persecution in many forms. He was scourged and imprisoned.

Paul at Rome. — On his last visit to Jerusalem, Paul was arrested by Jewish authorities on a charge of blaspheming their religion and being a traitor to Cæsar. He was turned over to the Roman officials and transported to Rome for trial, because he was a Roman citizen. Here, while evidence was being gathered against him, he was permitted for a time "to dwell by himself, with a soldier that kept him"; and "he remained two whole years in his own hired lodging, and he received all that came in to him, preaching the Kingdom of God, and teaching the things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, without prohibition." Then, probably in 62 A.D., Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles, was put to death at the hands of Gentiles in the capital city of the pagan Roman Empire. He died a martyr to his faith in Christianity.

Paul's Contribution. — Paul's greatest contribution to Christianity was his recognition that it was intended for all men and his insistence that it should be preached to Gentiles as well as to Jews. He concluded that Christianity was not merely a reformation of

[1] It was at Antioch (about 42 A.D.) that the name "Christian" was first applied to the followers of Jesus. By the Jews, and later by the Romans, they were referred to as "Nazarenes."

Judaism, but an international religion which supplanted Judaism. By reaching this conclusion he increased the difficulty of converting the Jews, who were enormously proud of their separate existence, but he made it possible to preach Christianity among all the other varied nations and tribes of the vast Roman Empire. He was clearly substituting for the ancient notion that a particular



SAINT PAUL'S CHURCH AT ROME

Interior of the great basilica, or church, erected by Christian Roman Emperors in the fourth century over the burial place of Paul the Apostle. Almost entirely destroyed by fire in 1823, the church was rebuilt on the original foundation and in the original style and was consecrated in 1854.

nation is a "chosen" nation the idea that all men of all nations and of all races are brothers under the supreme fatherhood of a loving Creator and Redeemer.

Separation from Judaism. — Paul gradually won over the leaders of the Christian Church to his view of the matter. Peter had already, before the advent of Paul, received Gentiles into the

Church, but there had been criticism of Peter's action, and there was much opposition to Paul's work. Accordingly Paul went up to Jerusalem, pleaded with the leaders there (about 49 A.D.), and, with the backing of Peter, won an official recognition of the general exemption of Gentile Christians from the laws of Moses.

The Christians came more and more to observe only such precepts of the Old Testament as Jesus had especially commended, notably the Ten Commandments; even the Jewish Sabbath, the seventh day of the week (Saturday), which Jesus himself had observed, they superseded as their holy day with Sunday, the first day of the week, the day on which, according to them, Jesus had risen from the dead and the Holy Ghost had descended upon them. While mindful of the fact that Judaism was the parent of Christianity, they tended to mark off the latter sharply from the former. Perhaps eventually they would have done this anyway. The teachings of Jesus would have led naturally to such an outcome. But that the actual separation of Christianity from Judaism occurred so quickly is attributable chiefly to Paul's insight and determination.

Missionary Activity. — Another very great contribution of Paul to Christianity was his missionary zeal and ability. Paul knew Greek (and probably Latin) as well as Hebrew. He was almost as familiar with Græco-Roman paganism as with Judaism. Consequently he could address audiences in the language understood by them and could meet their various objections. Wherever he preached he gathered together a group of converts and appointed a presbyter (priest or elder) over them. He trained other missionaries, who went about doing likewise. He coöperated with the original apostles and was ever eager to safeguard the unity of the faith and organization of the new religion. Thereby was laid the foundation for the network of Christian churches which by 100 A.D. existed in all the major cities and towns of the Roman Empire and which kept in close touch with one another.

Paul's Epistles. — Paul did not confine his preaching to the spoken word. He wrote letters, or "epistles," to the churches which he had founded or to personal friends who were engaged, like him, in missionary work. In these letters he set forth his ideas

about Jesus and about Christianity, recounted his own conversion, related many things which he had learned from the apostles and other eye-witnesses of the public career of Jesus, expounded doctrines, inculcated virtue, or urged a more spiritual life. In the letters he praised, he admonished, he begged, he scolded. And these epistles of Paul constitute the first written records which we have of the gospel of Jesus and the beginnings of Christianity. Jesus himself left no written record. The first apostles were "ignorant and illiterate" men. But Paul was educated and cultured; he wrote excellent Greek, and the letters which appear under his name in our New Testament were written originally by him in the midst of his arduous labors between 50 and 62 A.D. They are important in the history of literature as well as in the history of Christianity.

Christianity in Conflict with Paganism

Condition of Pagan Civilization. — The century during which Christianity originated was the century during which the Roman Empire reached almost its greatest territorial extent and highest pagan culture and civilization. The great Greek thinkers and writers of the age of Pericles had passed away, but their influence was still felt. Latin literature had just arrived at maturity with Cicero, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Livy, Seneca, Pliny, and Tacitus. Intellectual curiosity was lively and education was widespread. Christianity may have originated among ignorant and illiterate men in the out-of-the-way province of Judæa, but its spread during the next two or three centuries was certainly throughout an Empire which was very highly civilized.

Reasons for Spread of Christianity. — Why did Christianity spread in such an empire? Why did an increasing number of pagans abandon the worship of their gods and accept the gospel of Jesus Christ? In answering these questions, it must be borne in mind that the early Christian missionaries were very active and zealous and that they were aided by certain circumstances:

(1) The unity and extent of the Roman Empire made it possible for them to travel extensively and to carry their gospel wherever they went.

(2) The existence of social inequality and of distressing poverty on the part of the masses made many persons, especially slaves and freedmen, receptive to the Christian teaching of human brotherhood.

(3) The existence of doubt about the actual truth of the old religions rendered many Roman citizens, even of the upper classes, prone to accept a new religion whose missionaries seemed quite certain of its truth.

Obstacles to Christianity. — But Christianity did not win an immediate victory. In fact, the struggle between Christianity and paganism was long and terrific. For if there were important reasons why Christianity spread throughout the Roman Empire, there were also important reasons why its spread was resisted. First, it was regarded in the beginning as a mere sect among the Jews. Secondly, the very fact that Christianity appeared from the outset as a "slave religion" created among the upper classes a marked social antipathy to it. Thirdly, Christianity was represented as a gloomy, kill-joy religion; its devotees were constantly assailing the immorality of the pagans and condemning the chariot races of the circus and the gladiatorial combats of the amphitheater. Many pagans would naturally hesitate to accept a religion which frowned upon well-established and much-enjoyed amusements and which demanded a radical change of morals.

Christianity Uncompromising. — Fourthly, and far more fateful than any of the foregoing reasons for resistance to the spread of Christianity, this new religion was vastly more exclusive and intolerant in its claims than any other religion (save Judaism) with which paganism had ever come in contact. The missionaries of other religions were quite content if they could get people to worship Isis or Mazda in addition to the Græco-Roman gods already worshipped. They would not stamp out paganism. They would merely make it bigger and better. They would let a person be at the same time a pagan and a member of their special religion. The Christian missionaries, on the other hand, could be content only if people abandoned altogether the worship of pagan gods and idols and gave themselves exclusively to Christ. To the Christians, Christ was not merely one of the gods; He

was the only Son of the one and only God. And they would listen to no compromise.

Emperor-Worship. — Finally, there was a political obstacle to the spread of Christianity. The Roman Emperors for at least two or three centuries were of the opinion that the only way in which their Empire could be held together was by insisting upon their own divine character, by welcoming all religions which were willing to rank the Emperor among the supreme deities, and by persecuting any religion which refused to pay divine worship to the Emperor. The priests of Isis and of Mazda, no less than the priests of the Greek and Latin forms of paganism, recognized the Roman Emperor as their high priest (*pontifex maximus*), and had no scruples about burning incense upon a special altar erected to him just as if he were a god. The Christian missionaries, on the other hand, insisted that, while they would render unto Cæsar the things which were Cæsar's, they must render only to God the things which were God's; and they could not bring themselves to recognize that Cæsar was God or that the incense which they might burn to God should be burned to Cæsar. Wherefore, the converts to Christianity, unlike the converts to other novel faiths of the time, were accused of treason to the state and were subjected to repeated and terrible persecutions.

Persecution of Christians. — We have already remarked how Jesus was put to death at Jerusalem and Paul at Rome as traitors to the Roman Empire. Peter appears also to have suffered death at Rome. And so it went with most of the original apostles and with a large number of later converts. Some were crucified, some were beheaded, some were burned, some were thrown to the lions in the amphitheater. Many died because of their faith, a faith that to pagan Romans seemed inconsistent with good citizenship in the Empire and loyalty to the Emperor.

Yet Christianity weathered the storms. The devotees of the new religion resorted to secret meetings, sometimes in the city burying-grounds (the so-called catacombs); and they spread their gospel less by the written word than by the spoken word. Besides, it should be remembered that the pagan persecution of Christianity was not thorough. A good deal of it was the result of overmuch

zeal on the part of some official or the outcome of mob wrath. A fire, a famine, a hint from the jealous priests of the pagan temple in a given town that "the Christians are to blame," would often suffice to bring before the local magistrate an excited, angry



ROMAN CATACOMBS

Underground burial places of ancient Rome. There are miles and miles of these vaults and tunnels in and about Rome.

rabble clamoring, "The Christians to the lions!"; and the magistrate, unless he were at once strong and kindly, would consent to what the rabble demanded.

In the third century, when the number of Christians was increasing more rapidly, several Emperors made systematic efforts to uproot Christianity throughout the Empire. To this end the whole power of the government, the army, and the police was exerted. Thousands of Christians were seized and tortured and either killed or sent to a more lingering death of hard labor in the

mines. Undoubtedly many persons who had accepted the new religion deserted it when they were threatened with death or torture. Yet even a systematic general persecution always stopped short before achieving its full aim; and the calmness and even rejoicing with which large companies of humble men and women endured excruciating torment for the sake of their Christian faith affected many an intelligent pagan.

Growth of Christianity. — Gradually, despite persecution and despite prejudice and opposition, Christianity made headway in the Roman Empire. At the close of the first century there were Christian congregations in all the chief cities of the Empire. At the end of the second century perhaps five per cent of the population of the Empire were Christians. At the close of the third century the Christians were still a minority, but they were a well-organized and growing minority. Throughout these three centuries most Christians were to be found in cities, rather than in the country districts. In fact, the very word "pagan" meant in Latin "rural fellow" or "countryman," and was used by Christians as a term of derision to describe a follower of that old religion which survived in the rural regions after townsfolk had turned to the new faith.

Faith of the Christians. — We have explained that there were certain circumstances in the Roman Empire of the time which aided the spread of Christianity and that there were certain other circumstances which hindered its spread. What finally decided the issue and gave the advantage to Christianity, as against most other religions of that day, was the ardent faith of the early Christians and the simplicity of the gospel they preached. All the other religions (except Judaism) — Græco-Roman paganism, the religion of Isis, etc. — were based upon the worship of legendary gods and heroes. They were founded upon mythology. Christianity alone was based upon what its followers believed to be an historical fact of recent occurrence. Jesus Christ was to them a real historical character; he had actually lived; his preaching had been heard and remembered. Christianity in some of its externals borrowed ideas and practices from other religions,[1] but in its great central idea and worship it was, and still is, unique among the

[1] See pp. 417–418, 434.

world's religions. This fact was of undoubted advantage to it in its conflict with paganism.

So strong and compelling had been the faith of the apostles and other eye-witnesses of Jesus's public career, so convinced were they of the literal truth of his life and teachings, that they

INTERIOR OF THE COLOSSEUM

Present-day ruins. It was here that many early Christians were martyred.

had been willing to suffer all manner of torture and martyrdom for their faith. Paul, who had talked with the original apostles, was equally convinced, and, as we have seen, he went to his death with like faith. Such faith, communicated to later generations, continued to be highly personal and very intense. It was in marked contrast to the vague general faith or doubt of the pagans. Few pagans went to a martyr's death for the strong personal faith within them.

The Early Organization of Christianity

The Ecclesia or Church. — The idea that all Christians should be united in a corporate body — an *ecclesia*, as the Greeks called it, or a *church*, as we call it — goes back to the original apostles and to the sayings of Jesus himself. He had been quite insistent that his followers should be one, "as he was one"; and most of the early Christians believed that it was vitally necessary to preserve the purity and oneness of their faith through an ecclesiastical organization — a church.

The First Churches. — The first Christian church was organized at Jerusalem, immediately after the resurrection and ascension of Jesus. Then, with the preaching of the new faith outside of Judæa, churches were established at Antioch, Alexandria, Ephesus, Corinth, etc. A Christian church appears to have been founded at Rome, the capital of the Empire, during the reign of Claudius (41–54 A.D.); Paul addressed one of his famous epistles to it and afterward visited it in person. All these churches kept in friendly touch with one another, and their members thought of themselves as members of a larger whole, of the entire body of Christian believers.

Early Organization. — Indeed, the word "church" was used from an early date in two senses: first, to indicate a local body of Christians, such as that at Jerusalem or at Rome or at Alexandria or at Antioch; and secondly, to denote a confederation of all the local churches, the whole body of the Christian faithful. The exact nature of the organization of the earliest local churches and the exact manner in which these local churches were federated into a universal church, have been subjects of much controversy. We do not know a great deal about them, because we have comparatively few records, and what records we have can be interpreted in various ways. By the third century, however, the organization of the Christians was something like this:

The Clergy. — There was a Catholic (meaning "Universal") Church, which comprised all the local churches and which claimed to be the church founded by Jesus Christ and possessed of his authority to preach his gospel. It had three sets of officials: first,

the bishops (in Greek, the *episcopoi*) who were recognized as the successors of the original apostles and who resided in the chief cities and were overseers of several neighboring local churches; secondly, the priests (in Greek, the *presbyteroi*) who had charge of particular local churches, under the general oversight of a bishop; and thirdly, the deacons, who in every community assisted the priest and had special care of the poor. The bishops communicated with one another by visits and letters and together constituted a governing board of the Catholic Church. A bishop held office for life, and upon his death his successor was elected and "consecrated," that is, had the hands of fellow bishops laid upon him as a symbol that he was thenceforth a successor of the apostles, called by Jesus Christ and guided by the Holy Ghost. This was the idea of "apostolic succession."

THE APOSTLE PETER

A famous bronze statue, dating from at least the fourth century. It is in the basilica of Saint Peter at Rome.

The Church at Rome. — Among the local churches, that at Rome played a prominent rôle. The church at Rome had been visited by Paul while he was a prisoner, and, according to a tradition which is nowadays widely accepted, it was also visited by Peter. Other places — notably Antioch — had been honored by the presence and preaching of these great leaders of the new religion; but it was at Rome that, according to tradition, they bore witness to the faith by the shedding of their blood, and that their tombs were venerated. Then, too, Jerusalem, the first center of Christianity, had been destroyed by a Roman army as the result of a Jewish rebellion,[1] and consequently the church at Jerusalem was no longer in a position of leadership. But above all, the belief that the bishops of Rome

[1] See p. 340.

were the successors of Peter, the chief of the Apostles, made Rome the chief center of the Church.

The Bishop of Rome a Pope. — In the early centuries of the Christian era, the word "pope" (meaning "father") was a title applied to any bishop. Gradually, however, it came to be applied almost exclusively to that bishop who claimed to be the chief of all Christian bishops — the bishop of Rome. The word employed to designate the office and power of pope is "papacy."

MOSAIC IN SAINT PAUL'S CHURCH AT ROME

Christ, in the center, blessing in the Greek manner; Peter and Andrew at the right; Paul and Luke at the left.

The Bible. — At the very time when the ecclesiastical organization of Christianity was being effected, the Christian Scriptures — the "books" of the Christian Bible — were taking form. The epistles of Paul, written between 50 and 62 A.D., are the earliest Christian writings of which we can be sure. They contain no indications of the existence at that time of any written record of the life and teaching of Jesus. This is not strange. The story of Jesus and the message that he was the Messiah were first delivered to persons in Judæa who had seen and heard him or had heard much about him. They did not require to be told who he was. But within a few years, as the work of the Christian missionaries

extended to persons who had no first-hand knowledge of him, the need must have been felt of writing down the facts of his life and his precepts which hitherto had been transmitted orally.

Precisely when the four gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John were written, we do not know. We do know that by the middle of the second century these four accounts of Christ's life and teachings were received by Christians as authentic narratives which had been written by authors in the time of the apostles, and were read, along with prophetic writings of the Old Testament, at the religious services of the Christians. It is almost certain that they were actually written before the end of the first century; it is probable that Mark's gospel was written between 65 and 70 A.D. from information which Mark had derived chiefly from Peter, and that Matthew's and Luke's gospels were based in part on an even earlier written record and were composed shortly after 70 A.D. The "Acts of the Apostles" was written by Luke as a continuation of his gospel-story. The fourth gospel, the epistles of John, and the "Apocalypse" (Revelation) appear to have received their present form toward the close of the first century. It was not, however, until the last quarter of the second century that the conception of a Christian Bible in two parts, Old Testament and New Testament, was definitely established, and even then it was still a matter of considerable dispute as to what writings should be included in the New Testament.

Heresies. — The Church had its troubles and setbacks. It had its troubles with pagans and with the pagan government of the Roman Empire. Many of its laymen, priests, and bishops, including a goodly number of the bishops of Rome, died the death of martyrs. But it also had its troubles with Christians who resisted its authority or rejected its teaching. It kept the majority of Christians united in one faith and one practice, but it could not keep all Christians united.

Almost from the beginning the Church was troubled by heretics (hĕr′ĕ-tĭks), that is, persons who held some religious opinion or belief opposed to the doctrines of the main body of the Church. Such an opinion or belief was called a heresy (hĕr′ĕ-sĭ). During the first three centuries ever so many groups of heretics cropped

up here and there, only to be denounced by the bishops and to wane and make way for the rise of other heresies. Few of them lasted long, but they often prevented the Christians from presenting a united front. It is impossible for us to discuss these early heresies in detail. Most of them resulted from attempts to introduce either Jewish or pagan ideas into the teaching of Christianity.

Yet, despite heresy and despite persecution, Christianity and the Catholic Church eventually won, in the fourth century, a great triumph. The Church secured the toleration, the protection, and at length the allegiance of the Roman Emperors, and Christianity finally supplanted paganism throughout the Empire.

The Triumph of Christianity in the Roman Empire

Conversions in the 3d Century. — In the third century, the tide of conflict between paganism and Christianity began to turn in favor of the latter. Hitherto the bulk of the converts to the new religion had been of the lower classes, but henceforth men of all ranks and classes became converts — lawyers, physicians, officers in the army, officials in the civil service, judges, even governors of provinces. The wives, sisters, and daughters accompanied or more often preceded the men.

Persecution by Diocletian. — In an effort to stem the tide, the Emperor Diocletian undertook in the first years of the fourth century the greatest — and last — persecution of the Christians. He decreed that Christianity should be suppressed. Church buildings were to be destroyed, Christian writings seized and burned, and all Christians compelled to sacrifice to the pagan gods on pain of torture and slavery. Thousands of Christians were put to death. Yet the persecution was a failure. Diocletian simply could not put to death a large fraction of all his subjects. His successors, faced with the impossible task of destroying Christianity, took up the easier task of reconciling it with their own power and authority.

Toleration under Constantine. — In the year 311 the Emperor Galerius issued an edict ending the persecutions and according toleration to the Christians. And then Constantine appeared on the scene. He had been a Roman general in Gaul and Britain,

a pagan inclined to monotheism and on friendly terms with some of the Christian leaders. Fighting his way to the emperorship in the year 312, he and his army are said to have seen in the sky a bright cross with the words "in this sign, conquer," and in a dream that night Christ bade him take it for his standard. Constantine promptly replaced the pagan emblem of the eagle on the standards of the Roman army with the Christian emblem of the cross (the labarum, as it was called in the army), won a victory over his rival, and thus became Emperor. In 313 he issued the Edict of Milan, which went far beyond the edict of Galerius two years earlier. Now, for the first time in history, the principle of universal religious toleration was officially laid down; and for almost a century thereafter it was the general law of the Roman Empire.

CONSTANTINE
The first Christian Emperor.

Council of Nicæa. — Constantine did not openly confess himself a Christian and receive baptism until just before his death in the year 337. But his reign was marked by constant patronage of Christianity. It was under his auspices that the first General

(or ecumenical) Council of the Bishops of the Catholic Church was held in the year 325 at Nicæa (Nī-sē′*a*), in Asia Minor, in order to regulate the affairs of the Church after the long period of persecution and to assure the unity of its faith and discipline. Local church councils had long been held for the decision of local questions, but a general council was a novelty. The Council of Nicæa was attended by about three hundred bishops from all parts of the Empire (except Britain and Illyricum) and from Armenia; the bishop of Rome was represented by two of his priests.

Arianism Condemned. — The Council of Nicæa adopted several canons (that is, church laws) and settled several minor disputes. Its chief business, however, was to deal with an important heresy which had risen in Egypt and which threatened to divide Christianity at the very moment when Christianity was at final grips with paganism. The new heresy was Arianism (ā′rĭ-ăn-ĭzm), a doctrine preached by a priest by the name of Arius (ā′rĭ-ŭs). Arianism questioned both the deity of Jesus Christ and the unity of God. If the former doctrine had been abandoned, Christianity might easily have become a mere monotheistic philosophy and been merged in Stoicism or Epicureanism. If the latter doctrine had been relinquished, Christianity might have sunk back into pagan polytheism. The Council of Nicæa kept both doctrines and reconciled them by teaching the mystery of the Trinity (three Persons in one God). The Council defined the official faith in a statement known as the Nicæan Creed, and condemned Arianism as a heresy.

The Survival of Arianism. — The Council of Nicæa did not end Arianism. It spread, especially in the eastern provinces of the Empire, and received official support from the Emperor Constantius (kŏn-stăn′shĭ-*ŭ*s), the son and successor of Constantine. Constantius banished Catholic bishops throughout the East and replaced them with Arian bishops. For a time it looked as if Arianism might become the state religion.

But Julian (jōōl′yăn), who reigned as sole Emperor from 361 to 363, repudiated Christianity altogether and made a final desperate attempt to restore paganism as the official religion of the state. Julian failed, but his hostility to all forms of Christianity, Arianism

as well as Catholicism, enabled the Catholic majority among the Christians to make headway against the Arian minority.

Though one or two Emperors who succeeded Julian were favorable to Arianism, the Emperor Theodosius (thē′ŏ-dō′shĭ-ŭs) finally decided the question in favor of Catholicism. In the year 380, Theodosius was baptized a Catholic Christian and at once issued an edict requiring general acceptance of the religion "committed by the Apostle Peter to the Romans, and now professed by the bishop of Rome and the bishop of Alexandria," and threatening heretics with punishment. A second General Council, held at Constantinople in 381 on the call of Theodosius, reaffirmed the Nicæan creed as the creed of reunited Christianity.[1] Thenceforth Arianism died out in the Roman Empire, though it survived three hundred years longer as the faith of barbarian tribes from the North.[2]

Christianity Becomes the State Religion. — Theodosius the Great (379–395) finally made the Roman Empire a Christian Empire. He tolerated paganism as the religion of individuals but not as the state religion. He confiscated the large revenues of the Vestal Virgins and forbade them to hold any property. He ordered the removal of the altar and statue of Victory which Julian had restored to the Senate house. He put an end to the Olympic games. Paganism survived for some time longer among the rural population, particularly in the West, and among some of the nobles and literary men, but its place as the state religion of the Roman Empire was now taken by Christianity.

Theodosius and his successors not only tolerated the Church but sought to incorporate it in their imperial system and to make membership in it a mark of Roman citizenship. They exempted the Church from taxation and helped to defray its expenses. They relieved the Christian clergy from military service and allowed them to have law courts and try certain kinds of cases. They

[1] Subsequently, other General Councils of the Church were held under the auspices of Christian Emperors of the Roman Empire: Ephesus (431), Chalcedon (451), Constantinople II (553), Constantinople III (680), Nicæa II (787), and Constantinople IV (869). These Councils enacted additional canons and further explained Christian doctrine.

[2] See pp. 464–465.

granted to bishops powers almost equal to those of the governors of provinces. They gradually returned to the idea of the earlier pagan Emperors that the Roman Empire could be maintained only if it were based on religious unity, and consequently, being Christians, they did their utmost to stamp out heresy and to make heretics conform to one Church.



THE OLD CHURCH OF SAINT PETER AT ROME

This church was built in the fourth century over the tomb of the Apostle Peter and on the site of an earlier church. It was torn down in the sixteenth century to make way for the present colossal church of Saint Peter. See pages 763, 764.

Despite the insistence of early Christians that religion should be promoted not by force but only by instruction and moral persuasion, and despite the protest of some prominent Christians of the time, including Ambrose of Milan, the Emperor Theodosius deprived heretics of all right to the exercise of their religion, "excluded them from all civil offices, and threatened them with fines, confiscation of property, banishment, and even in some cases with death." In the year 385 seven heretics were put to death at Trier, on the northwestern frontier of the Empire. Religious

intolerance was again the law and practice of the Roman Empire, this time in behalf of Christianity. It was a big price which Christianity paid for becoming a state religion.

Effects on the Church. — The Church, as it grew and prospered and came into close relationship with the state, elaborated its ritual and its organization. Magnificent church buildings were erected, and the ceremonies of public worship assumed a complexity and a grandeur befitting the majesty of the Roman Empire. The organization of the Church was patterned more closely after the model of the Empire. Just as the Empire was divided for political administration into four great prefectures, so it was divided for ecclesiastical affairs into four patriarchates (Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem), and a little later a fifth (Constantinople) was added. These patriarchates, like the prefectures, were subdivided into "provinces" and "dioceses."

Influence of Christianity. — The triumph of Christianity within the Roman Empire meant that Christian customs and usages became dominant in the Roman Empire. Sundays and special feast-days of the Christian Church were thenceforth regularly observed as imperial holidays. Christian ceremonies were popularly associated with such familiar experiences as marriage, birth, and death. And not only were outward observances changed, but the interior life of individuals and of the state was gradually transformed.

On the Family. — There can be little doubt that Christianity inculcated higher standards of moral conduct in the masses of its disciples than did paganism and that it performed a great service in purifying and uplifting society. Christianity put special emphasis upon the home and the family as the very center of religious and moral life. It placed new responsibilities upon the father of a family. It stressed the duty of parents to children, and of children to parents. It signally raised the position of women and made marriage a sacrament, and insisted upon purity of life.

On Slavery. — Another great social change which Christianity wrought affected the working people and the slaves. Hitherto, those who had toiled with their hands had been looked down upon and despised as inferiors; many of them were outright slaves;

and slavery was the basis of Greek and Roman economic life. Christianity, however, taught that rich and poor are equal in the sight of God; all have immortal souls; and the poor man may be a better Christian than the rich man. Slavery was not abolished throughout the Roman Empire all at one time or by one act, but the Church encouraged the emancipation of slaves and protected the freedmen.

On Labor. — At the same time, the Church, by pointing out that Jesus had worked with his hands as a carpenter and by teaching that manual labor is not a disgrace but a wholesome and honorable way of earning a livelihood, did much to establish the dignity of labor. It was a timely lesson in good economics. Christianity held up new and much needed ideals of honest work and of simplicity, frugality, and temperance in living.

On Cruelty and Vice. — Still another way in which the influence of Christianity was shown was the campaign waged by the early Christians, more and more successfully, against the vice and cruelty which characterized the Roman Empire as long as it was pagan. Christianity introduced greater humanity and humaneness into public and private life. It interested itself, as paganism had never done, in all manner of charitable undertakings, in the moral and physical well-being of prisoners, in the establishment and support of hospitals, in the care of the poor, the sick, the widows and orphans, the lame, the halt, and the blind. It stopped the selling of children and it forbade all traffic for immoral purposes. It protested against immorality not only in private life but in books and on the stage. It denounced, too, the Roman gladiatorial combats in which slaves were obliged to fight and kill one another for the amusement of the idle crowds; and with the triumph of Christianity, gladiatorial combats gradually came to an end. To be sure, cruelty and vice were never abolished, but under Christianity they were diminished and their opposites were held up as ideals of individual and social behavior.

On Art and Literature. — Christianity produced new types and forms of art and literature. Beautiful church buildings were reared in the so-called Romanesque (rō′măn-ĕsk′) style. Painting and sculpture felt the new influence, and scenes from the life of

An Early Church in the Romanesque Style

Interior of the church of San Apollinare Nuovo at Ravenna, built shortly after 500 A.D. and adorned with very beautiful mosaics.

Christ or from the history of the Church were delicately depicted on walls or ruggedly chiselled from marble. Mosaics lent themselves especially to the new needs of decoration, and the manufacture of mosaics was carried to a high degree of excellence by the Christians. Christianity, moreover, revolutionized Greek and Latin literature. To the earlier golden ages of classical or pagan literature succeeded now in the fourth and fifth centuries the "golden age" of Christian literature.

Christian Literature. — Suppose we recall a few of the literary lights of this age. *Eusebius* (ū-sē′bĭ-ŭs, 265–340), the scholarly bishop of Cæsarea, wrote in Greek a monumental "Church History," a "Life of Constantine," and a "Chronicle" (in which he sought to harmonize the chronology of the ancient Hebrews with that of the ancient Greeks and Romans). *John Chrysostom* (krĭs′ŏs-tŭm, 345–407), bishop of Constantinople, acquired fame as a preacher (his last name means, in Greek, "golden mouthed"), and left to us numerous sermons in elegant Greek. *Ambrose* (ăm′brōz, 340–397), bishop of Milan, composed several beautiful Latin hymns which are still sung in Christian churches. *Augustine* (ô-gŭs′tĭn, 354–430), bishop of Hippo (in northern Africa), published in Latin a charming account of his early life, the "Confessions," and a great book, the "City of God," which presented an historical and philosophical approach to Christianity and the Catholic Church and which probably exerted a more profound influence on later generations in Christendom than any other book except the Bible. *Jerome* (jĕ-rōm′, 340–420), a priest and secretary to the bishop of Rome, the foremost scholar of the age, besides writing in Latin a large number of histories, commentaries, and controversial tracts, translated anew the books of the Old Testament from Hebrew and those of the New Testament from Greek. Jerome's translation of the whole Christian Bible into literary Latin was called the "Vulgate" and became the official version of the Holy Scriptures for the Catholic Church in the West; it was the Bible of the Middle Ages, and the Bible from which many translations into modern languages have been made. Anyone who appreciates what an enormous influence the Bible has had on the history and culture of Christendom must pay a tribute to

Jerome and to the age which produced him — the age of the transformation of pagan into Christian civilization.

The Old and the New. — It must not be supposed that the new Christian civilization was a complete break with the old pagan civilization. The new grew in the midst of the old and appropriated from it whatever was compatible with itself. Christianity did not so much destroy pagan culture as modify it and stamp it with its own distinctive character. We shall have occasion to note in future chapters how Christian civilization, not once but many times, renewed its debt to that older civilization which it had vanquished and supplanted.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. What was the political status of Palestine in the reign of Augustus?
2. Compare or contrast the teachings of Jesus with those of Gautama, of Confucius, and of the Stoics. In what respect did he differ from these religious reformers and philosophers?
3. Give an account of the work of Paul, with special reference to the spread of Christianity among non-Jewish peoples.
4. Why was Christianity sometimes called a "slave religion"? Was it exclusively a religion of the working classes?
5. Summarize the chief reasons for the growth of Christianity in the Roman Empire.
6. Referring to Chapter XI, as well as to Chapter XIII, discuss the practice of emperor-worship, and explain why the Christian attitude toward emperor-worship was an important factor in arousing opposition to Christianity.
7. Give an account of the persecutions of the Christians in the Roman Empire. Why were the Christians persecuted? Why did the persecutions fail?
8. Explain the origin and meaning of the terms "pagan" and "paganism."
9. What were the Christian gospels? When were they written?
10. What was Arianism? How was it dealt with by the General Councils of the Church?
11. Discuss the attitude of each of the following Emperors toward Christianity: Nero, Diocletian, Galerius, Constantine, Julian, Theodosius.
12. What social changes were caused or promoted by Christianity?
13. What effect did Christianity have on Greek and Latin literature? Mention some of the outstanding Christian writers of the fourth and fifth centuries and contrast their works with those of the classical writers of Augustan Rome and Periclean Athens.

SPECIAL TOPICS

Mithraism. De Burgh, *Legacy of the Ancient World*, 282–284; Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, 585–626.

Later Roman paganism. Dill, *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire*, 74–112.

The Jewish background of Christianity. Walker, *History of the Christian Church*, 11–18.

The work of St. Paul. Walker, *History of the Christian Church*, 25–32; *New Testament* (use index); Foakes-Jackson, *Life of Saint Paul*, ch. xxiv.

Spread of Christianity in the Roman Empire. Friedländer, *Roman Life*, III, 186–214; Cambridge Medieval History, I, ch. iv; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. xv.

Pagan writers on Christianity. Botsford, *Source-Book of Ancient History*, 522–525; or Munro, *Source Book of Roman History*, 164–168.

Roman persecution of Christians. Flick, *Rise of the Mediæval Church*, 91–108; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. xvi.

Constantine and the Church. Flick, *Rise of the Mediæval Church*, 112–128; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. xx; Cambridge Medieval History, I, 1–14.

Julian's attempt to restore paganism. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. xxiii; Cambridge Medieval History, I, 98–112.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THE TEACHER

W. Walker, *History of the Christian Church.* A. C. Flick, *Rise of the Mediæval Church.* L. M. O. Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church.* B. J. Kidd, *History of the Church to A.D. 461.* F. J. Foakes-Jackson, *History of the Christian Church to A.D. 461.* F. X. Von Funk, *Manual of Church History.* Cambridge Medieval History, I. T. R. Glover, *Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire.* F. Cumont, *Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism.* E. G. Sihler, *From Augustus to Augustine.* T. G. Tucker, *Life in the Roman World of Nero and St. Paul.* S. Dill, *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire.* F. J. Foakes-Jackson, *Studies in the Life of the Early Church.* J. B. Firth, *Constantine the Great.* A. Gardner, *Julian, Philosopher and Emperor, and the Last Struggle of Paganism.*

SOURCE MATERIALS

The New Testament. K. Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers* (2 vols.). Eusebius, *Church History* (trans. by A. C. McGiffert). A. Roberts and J. Donaldson (ed.), *Ante-Nicene Fathers* (10 vols.). P. Schaff and H. Wace, *Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (28 vols.).

CHAPTER XIV

THE COMING OF THE BARBARIANS

Invasions of the Roman Empire from the North: the Germans

"Barbarians" North of the Roman Frontier. — The northern boundary of the Roman Empire during the first four centuries of the Christian era followed two great rivers — the Rhine and the Danube.[1] To the north of these rivers there is more land than to the south, but in the fourth century A.D. the population was much sparser and the civilization was vastly inferior. The tribes and peoples living in northern Europe spoke various languages — German (or Teutonic), Slavic, Finnish, and Celtic — but all of them were styled "barbarians" by the Greeks and Romans.

The Germans. — Among the northern "barbarians" the Germans predominated, but in the fourth century they were not the highly civilized Germans of modern times and they were not nearly so civilized as the citizens of the Roman Empire of their own day. Their culture resembled that of the North American Indians rather than the culture of the Christian peoples ruled by Constantine and Theodosius. They could not read or write; they had no alphabet and they left no written records. What we know about them must be learned from their physical remains — their monuments, graves, and implements — and from the writings of the Romans.

Their Expansion. — The earliest Germans of whom we have historical knowledge lived in northwestern Europe, and thence extended their settlements by conquest to the northeast at the expense of the Finns, to the east and southeast at the expense of the Slavs, and to the south and southwest at the expense of the Celts. At the time when the Roman Republic was being trans-

[1] See pp. 350–353 and map between pp. 334–335.

MAP OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE, 400 A.D.

formed into the Roman Empire, and at the time when Jesus was preaching his gospel in Judæa, the Germans were winning their way against the Celts and Slavs right down to the rivers Rhine and Danube. Julius Cæsar fought against Germans as well as against the Celtic Gauls and described both peoples in his "Commentaries on the Gallic War." [1] Tacitus, the famous Latin author of the next century, wrote an interesting essay about the Germans. It was the Roman Emperors of the century of Tacitus who definitely fortified the line of the Rhine and Danube against further encroachments of the northern barbarians.[2] During the ensuing three centuries, the southern Germans were in continual contact and often in direct conflict with the northern Romans. The two populations, so different in civilization, faced each other along a two-thousand-mile front from the North Sea to the Black Sea.

Tribal Organization. — The Germans, unlike the Romans, had no political unity. They were not all subject to one king or emperor. On the contrary, they were broken up into numerous tribes, as the North American Indians were, and the German tribes went on the "warpath" against one another almost as eagerly as they attacked Celts or Slavs or Romans. Each tribe had a chieftain (called a king by the Romans) who was chosen by the warriors, and a council of the chief men, and also priests and "medicine-men." The tribesmen wore long flowing cloaks and skins of wild beasts, and their main business was fighting and hunting. Youths were trained to bear arms at an early age and were accustomed to attach themselves as loyal followers to some older warrior of famed prowess. The men of a tribe spent most of their time, when they were not fighting or hunting, in idleness, and frequently indulged in gambling and drunkenness. The manual labor was performed by the women and by captives who had been made slaves.

Primitive Culture. — Yet the Germans were not completely uncivilized. They lived in fixed habitations and knew something of the science and art of agriculture. They owned lands in common and parcelled them out from time to time among the several families. They were rigidly bound in their dealings with one

[1] See pp. 297–299. [2] See pp. 350–353. For Tacitus, see p. 374.

another by a fairly elaborate set of unwritten customs and usages (the so-called Germanic Law). In religion they had a paganism of their own, with especially warlike gods, such as Tiu, Woden, Thor, and Frigg (from whom have been derived the English words for Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday), with a belief in elves, valkyries, and other supernatural beings, with a priesthood, and with sacred groves and religious festivals. They sang songs and told stories. They developed a calendar, and later (possibly in the sixth century) German tribes in Scandinavia began to use a rude alphabet — the Runic alphabet — which thereafter enabled them to make inscriptions and to write in their native language. The Germans had no cities; they lived in detached huts in villages or on farms. They had reached a relatively high degree of craftsmanship in the manufacture of bronze implements, though their knowledge of iron came only from their contacts with Celts and Romans. The Germans along the seacoast and rivers had early acquired considerable proficiency in the building and use of boats.

Immigration into the Empire. — From the first to the fourth century A.D., Germans were immigrating from the north into the Roman Empire in ever increasing numbers. At first the immigration took the form mainly of armed marauding expeditions. A chieftain would collect a band of warriors, and, managing to overcome or elude the frontier guards, would descend in force upon the farms and cities of one of the Roman provinces, perhaps Gaul or Pannonia or Dacia; cattle and crops and tools would be stolen from the fields; arms and jewelry and money would be extorted from the towns; Roman citizens would be killed or captured, the captives being enslaved or held for ransom; and the expedition would fight its way back north as best it could.

German Settlers and Slaves. — Armed incursion was but one of the forms of German immigration. Many Germans settled permanently within the Roman Empire, and some were forced to settle there, as, for example, tribesmen who were captured by the Romans either in repulsing an incursion on the soil of the Empire or in conducting punitive expeditions into Germany. Captured Germans were often employed as slaves or permanent tenants on the large Roman estates; they were needed to replace Roman

farmers and laborers who were continually moving to the cities. For a long time there was a commerce in slaves between Germany and the Roman provinces.

Germans in the Army. — Germans entered the Empire, too, to serve in the Roman army, sometimes under compulsion and sometimes of their own accord. In time the barbarian troops in imperial service actually outnumbered the native Roman troops, and they took an ever more active part in the chronic civil wars between military claimants for the emperorship. As a rule, however, they were to be found, like the native Roman troops, fighting for this or that would-be Emperor, not fighting against the Empire. They long continued to have an enormous respect for the Empire. Several Emperors of the fourth and fifth centuries had German blood in their veins.

Varieties of Immigration. — It should be clear that the immigration of Germans into the Roman Empire was not a single event under one form and with one motive. For several centuries they were coming, some as pirates and pillagers, others as slaves and captives, still others as settlers, farmers, or soldiers. Some came to serve an Emperor or to take office in the Empire and most came to seek wider opportunities for personal profit and prosperity. By the fourth century many Germans must have become Romans and imbibed a good deal of Roman civilization.

The Great Invasions. — Towards the close of the fourth century a significant change occurred in the nature of German immigration. Thenceforth, especially throughout the fifth century, whole tribes and federations of tribes moved as bodies, most often as fighting bodies, across the northern boundary of the Empire and settled in the Roman provinces. These were the great German invasions. They paved the way for the loss to the Empire of its western provinces and for the establishment of the German kingdoms from which have developed the modern nations of western Europe.

The Chief Tribes. — At that time — towards the close of the fourth century — important German tribes were spread out along the northern frontier of the Roman Empire as follows: the Franks, a federation of tribes, were north of the Rhine, in what is now southern Holland and the Rhineland; in the rear of the Franks,

along the coast of the North Sea and reaching up into Jutland (Denmark), were Saxons, Angles, and Jutes; the Alemans (ȧl′ȧ-mănz) and Burgundians lived in the valley of the Main, in what is now southern Germany; the Vandals dwelt north of the upper Danube along the Oder and in the plains of Austria and Hungary; behind the Vandals were Sueves (swēvz) on the Elbe, and Langobards (lăng′ō-bärdz) or Lombards on the Oder; the Visigoths (vĭz′ĭ-gŏths) or West Goths occupied the country north of the lower Danube, the country which is now called Rumania; and the Ostrogoths (ŏs′trŏ-gŏths) or East Goths inhabited an extensive area north of the Black Sea.

Cause of the Invasions. — What caused all these people at about the same time to invade the Roman Empire was chiefly a great and sudden and terrible migration of Mongol nomads from the deserts and plains of Turkestan (in Central Asia), around the Caspian Sea and across the Volga and Don rivers, into eastern and central Europe. We shall say more about the Mongol nomads later, but here it will suffice to state that the nomad migration of the fourth century was of particularly ferocious peoples, such as the Huns and Alans, who assailed one German tribe after another, conquering some and creating in all a dread and terror and an intense restlessness. The Ostrogoths were the first to fall victims to the Huns and Alans; some submitted to their conquerors, but others fled southwestward and pressed with determination against their own kinsfolk, the Visigoths. The Visigoths, unable to repel the Ostrogoths, turned against German neighbors to the west and at the same time besought the Roman Emperor for permission to cross the Danube and secure lands and protection within the Empire. The danger and fear and example of Ostrogoths and Visigoths were quickly communicated to Vandals, Sueves, Burgundians, Alemans, Franks, and Saxons; all seemed to have but one thought and one purpose — to escape the nomads by seeking settlement within the Roman Empire. The great invasions began.

The Empire Overwhelmed. — The great invasions will be clearer to us if we mention each in turn, although it should be borne in mind that all of them occurred almost simultaneously. If the German tribes had come singly and at different times, they

might have been resisted or absorbed without grave permanent injury to the Empire. But as it was, the Roman Emperors were unequal to the task of defending their two-thousand-mile northern boundary at all points and at the same time.

The Visigoths. — The Visigoths, with the permission of the Emperor Valens (vā′lĕnz), crossed the Danube in 376; but, being ill-treated by Roman officials, they revolted and in the battle of Adrianople (378) defeated the Roman army and killed Valens. His successor, Theodosius the Great, made peace with them by granting them lands in the province of Lower Mœsia (mē′shĭ-ȧ), but they were not contented. Taking advantage of the internal and foreign disorders which followed the death of Theodosius (395), they again went "on the warpath" and found in their chieftain Alaric (ăl′ȧ-rĭk) an able leader. Alaric (370–410) had no desire to destroy the Roman Empire. He wished rather to secure more and better farmlands for his people and to obtain some important position in the Roman government for himself. Rebuffed by the Roman authorities, he led his semi-civilized Visigoths to the neighborhood of Constantinople and then, finding himself unable to undertake the siege of that strongly fortified city, he marched west and south through the unguarded pass of Thermopylæ into Greece. In Greece he and his tribe remained two years, plundering the towns and the countryside and occupying the famous cities of Athens, Corinth, and Sparta. At length a Roman army arrived on the scene, and Alaric withdrew with his booty to Epirus.

Alaric's Invasions of Italy. — At this point, the Emperor thought to make peace by settling the Visigoths in Illyricum and making Alaric the governor of the prefecture. But this only whetted the chieftain's ambition. With the purpose of forcing the authorities to enlarge his prefecture, Alaric led at least three great expeditions of his tribesmen into Italy. The first was defeated and turned back by a Roman army (402). The second laid siege to Rome (408) and was bought off by a ransom of more than a million dollars besides precious garments of silk and leather and three thousand pounds of pepper. The third and most important led to the actual capture of Rome. In the year 410 the Visigoths pillaged and plundered the city which had long been the mistress of

the Mediterranean world, though they spared the public buildings and the Christian churches. Alaric himself died shortly afterwards. He was on his way to Sicily and Africa in order to cut off the source of Italy's principal grain supplies, when a fatal illness seized him. He was laid to rest in the bed of the Busento River in southern Italy. A large number of slaves were employed in first diverting the course of the river and then bringing it back into its former channel after the dead chieftain and his treasures had been buried. In order that nobody might ever know the burial place, all the slaves who had been employed in the labor were killed.

The Visigoths in Gaul. — The Visigoths, after the death of Alaric, remained two years in Italy, ravaging the peninsula, and then turned their steps westward, crossed the Alps, and pursued their destructive course in southern Gaul. The Roman Emperor finally came to terms and permitted them (426) to settle in the region about Toulouse (tōō-lōōz′) and to constitute a separate, semi-independent state with a king of their own "in alliance with the Roman Empire."

Vandals, Sueves, and Alans. — Meanwhile, other German tribes were working havoc with the Empire. Vandals and Sueves had been at first pushed out of their northern homes and later joined by the nomad Asiatic Alans; the three peoples forced the passage of the Rhine in 406, devastated Gaul, even penetrated into Italy, and in 409 crossed the Pyrenees into Spain. Soon the Emperor felt obliged to make terms with them. He allotted northern Spain to the Sueves; Portugal and central Spain to the Alans; and southern Spain to the Vandals. As soon as the Visigoths were settled in southern Gaul, they proceeded to make war on the Sueves and Alans to the south of them and to incorporate in their state parts of northern Spain.

Gaiseric's Kingdom in Africa. — At the same time the remaining Alans united with the Vandals, and of the latter some 80,000 men, women, and children, under command of a celebrated chieftain, Gaiseric (gī′sĕr-ĭk) or Genseric (jĕn′sĕr-ĭk) by name, crossed the Straits of Gibraltar and possessed themselves of a large portion of northern Africa. Gaiseric captured Carthage in 439 and made it the capital of a Vandal kingdom which for a century was the center

of a kind of revived Carthaginian Empire. Gaiseric fitted out a large fleet and fought against the Roman Emperor with real genius and success. He led naval expeditions which ravaged the coasts of Sicily and Italy, and in 455 he occupied Rome and stayed long enough to enable the Vandals to take all the treasures which had been left by the Visigoths in 410. He even took prisoner the Empress and her daughter and married the latter to his son. Gaiseric died in 477, an old man, after raising the Vandal state to the height of its power and practically ending Roman sway in the western Mediterranean.

German Tribes in Gaul and Britain. — Meanwhile, too, northern and central Gaul and eastern Britain were being overrun by German tribesmen. The Alemans, pressed by Burgundians behind, began in 407 a campaign against the Roman province of Upper Germany and subjugated Strasbourg and the region of the upper Rhine. The Burgundians swept on past the Alemans into the valley of the Rhone. Simultaneously the more numerous tribes of the Frankish confederacy appropriated the greater part of northern Gaul, while to eastern Britain came Saxons, Angles, and Jutes. From the beginning of the fifth century the sway of the Roman Empire ceased in Britain and waned rapidly in Gaul.

Theodoric and the Ostrogoths. — In the meantime, a multitude of the Ostrogoths, the first of the German peoples to feel the shock of the invading Asiatic nomads, had left their homes north of the Black Sea and sought lands elsewhere. For a time they took the places vacated by their kinsfolk, the Visigoths, north of the Danube. In the year 380 they obtained permission from the Emperor to settle in Pannonia and Upper Mœsia. Here for a century they lived a semi-civilized life, maintaining their tribal organization and virtual independence, sometimes acting as formal allies of the Roman Emperor and sometimes participating in raids and robberies in other provinces of the Empire, as, for example, in 405 when they coöperated with Alaric and the Visigoths in attacking and despoiling Italy. In 488 their chieftain Theodoric (thē-ŏd′ŏ-rĭk), who had been educated at Constantinople and had commanded Roman armies, was commissioned by the Emperor to expel

from Italy another German chieftain, a certain Odovacar (ō-dŏ-väk′ĕr) or Odoacer (ō-dŏ-ā′sĕr), who had been lording it over the peninsula for several years. Theodoric at the head of his Ostrogoths discharged the commission with alacrity and complete success. He vanquished and killed Odovacar. But he settled the Ostrogoths permanently in Italy, and until his death in 526 he was the real ruler and king of the country.



Tomb of Theodoric at Ravenna

Result of the German Invasions. — By the end of the fifth century, German, rather than Roman, rule existed in Italy, Gaul, Britain, Spain, and most of North Africa. The power of the Roman Emperors was restricted to the eastern Mediterranean and henceforth centered in Constantinople rather than in Rome. The Roman Empire, thanks to the great German invasions of the fifth century, was becoming an Eastern Greek Empire. The West was witnessing the construction of German kingdoms on Christian-Roman foundations.

The Establishment of German Kingdoms in the West

The German Kingdoms. — The German tribesmen who immigrated into the Roman Empire and in the fifth century settled in the western provinces, established a number of kingdoms under the rule of their respective chieftains or "kings." Such was the kingdom of the Franks in northern Gaul; that of the Burgundians in southeastern Gaul; that of the Visigoths in southern Gaul and the greater part of Spain; that of the Sueves in northwestern Spain; that of the Vandals in northern Africa; that of the Ostrogoths in Italy; and those of the Angles and Saxons in Britain.

Roman Populations under German Rule. — With the possible exception of those in Britain, none of the German kingdoms expelled the native, Roman population or wilfully abolished Roman customs and usages. As a rule each barbarian "king," outside of Britain and the Rhine valley, was content to leave the bulk of the original population of his newly acquired territory in much the same condition as that in which he found them. He let them retain their own minor officials, their own Roman law, their own religion (Catholic Christianity or Roman paganism), and at least some of their own land; he let them pursue their customary vocations and observe their traditional usages. What change he effected was in the nature of superimposing a barbarian German state and society on top of the civilized Roman life of the country. He saw to it that his own German people had political and economic supremacy. He took from one-third to two-thirds of the public land from the original Roman holders and divided it among his tribesmen. He taxed the natives more than the immigrants. Though he usually respected the native aristocracy, he bestowed greater favors upon the chief men among the new settlers and thereby created a new nobility, based on personal bravery as well as on birth and wealth. He directly administered the affairs of his German subjects as a people apart from, and superior to, the rest of the population of his kingdom. The Germans, in such a kingdom, continued to live under their tribal German law and were therefore exempt from the Roman law; for a time they were prohibited from marrying Romans, but intermarriage soon became the custom.

Influence of Roman Culture. — The German tribesmen in these kingdoms learned much from their Roman neighbors. For one thing, many of them learned the Latin language, and though they spoke it very badly, it helped gradually to fuse the conquered and the conquerors into one and the same people. The earliest writing of these Germans was in Latin; and their kings utilized Latin to write down their customary tribal law. For example, a fifth-century king of the Visigoths published the laws of his people in Latin, and a little later a Frankish king issued a Latin version of the old laws of his tribe — the so-called Salic (săl′ĭk) laws. There were many things other than language which the conquering Germans borrowed from the conquered Romans — private property in land, styles of clothing and architecture, manners and customs.

A "Dark Age." — On the other hand, the new German kingdoms represented a distinct lowering of civilization. The protracted invasions, wars, plunderings, and devastations decreased the production of foodstuffs and manufactured goods, interfered most seriously with trade, and lessened personal security and well-being. The middle class of business men and professional men became hopelessly impoverished and largely disappeared. Cities declined rapidly, and grass grew in their streets. Besides, the fact that most of the Germans were themselves ignorant and illiterate had most unfortunate cultural effects upon the kingdoms which they dominated: little was done to keep the splendid Roman roads in repair or to support the other public works; public schools which the Romans had maintained were now closed for lack of pupils and teachers and for lack of funds; there was a sorry decline in literature and in all the arts and sciences. The establishment of German kingdoms in the former western provinces of the Roman Empire marked the beginning of a Dark Age in the history of Christian civilization.

Angles and Saxons in Britain. — The province which suffered most from German invasion and German rule was undoubtedly Britain. It had been the province which, of all those in the West, had been least "Romanized." When the Saxons and Angles came, they found a native population of Celts who still spoke their

original language and who had acquired only a smattering of Roman culture. Moreover, the conquerors were from a region of northern Europe more remote from previous contact with the Roman Empire than the lands inhabited by other German invaders, and they were probably less civilized. We know very little about the German conquest of Britain, beyond the facts that there was bitter and terrible fighting between Germans and Celts and wild disorder for two centuries and that German (Anglo-Saxon) language and law emerged utterly triumphant in England, while Celtic language and Celtic law were confined to Wales, Ireland, and the highlands of Scotland. From these facts it has been imagined by some writers that the German invaders slaughtered the natives or drove them westward and that modern Englishmen are descendants therefore of pure Anglo-Saxons. It is just as probable that the Germans who invaded Britain did not slay or expel all the Celts from England, but, rather, subjugated them and that modern Englishmen are descended from a fusion of Anglo-Saxons with Celts.

At any rate, the German conquest of Britain was unique in that the Angles and Saxons, unlike their German brethren on the Continent, did not adopt the language or religion or any of the institutions or customs of the earlier population of the Roman province which they invaded. They merely transplanted their own primitive customs and barbarous usages across the North Sea and established in England several tribal kingdoms of the sort which they had left behind in Holland and northwestern Germany. None of them knew how to read or write; they destroyed Roman civilization; and for two hundred years the history of Britain is a tragic blank. We lack reliable information even as to the names or locations of the first kingdoms established by the Angles and Saxons in Britain. Later, in the seventh century, we can detect at least seven German kingdoms in England — Kent, Sussex, Essex, Wessex, East Anglia, Mercia, and Northumbria — each with a tribal chieftain or "king" and all still warring with one another or with the Celts.

The Warring Kingdoms in Europe. — All the German kingdoms, those on the Continent as well as those in England, engaged in

almost incessant warfare. When they were not fighting the Roman Empire or the Celts, they were contending with one another. The fifth century and first quarter of the sixth century constituted an era of unparalleled disorder throughout the West. The Franks vanquished the Burgundians and defeated the Visigoths and fought the Ostrogoths; gradually the Franks extended their dominion over the greater part of Gaul. The Visigoths, compelled to relinquish some territory in southern Gaul, obtained ample compensation by conquering most of Spain from Sueves, Alans, and Vandals. By the year 525 the most important German states were the kingdoms of the Franks (in Gaul), the Visigoths (in Spain), the Ostrogoths (in Italy), and the Vandals (in northern Africa).

Revival of Roman Power. — Not all of these states were permanent. For the Roman Empire in the sixth century showed greater strength than it had displayed in the fifth century, and, reasserting its authority in the western Mediterranean, it put an end to some of the German kingdoms.

Justinian. — The re-strengthening of the Empire was due largely to the work of a very able man, the Emperor Justinian (527–565), the same man who issued the great code of Roman law[1] and built the great church of Saint Sofia in Constantinople. He waged successful war against the Persians to the east and against the Germans to the west.

The Army of Belisarius. — The Emperor, in his military enterprises, was aided by a large and well-organized army and by a competent and loyal general. The army was composed mainly of mercenaries, recruited from all the barbarians of the East and West — Huns, Vandals, Goths, Lombards, Slavs, Armenians, Arabs, Moors, etc., who enjoyed a fight and who were glad to sell their services to an Emperor who paid well. The commanding general of this motley array was Belisarius (bĕl′ĭ-sā′rĭ-*ŭs*), probably a Slav in origin, certainly a military genius of the first rank and the idol of his soldiers.

Reconquest of Carthage and Italy. — In 533 Justinian despatched Belisarius to Africa with an expedition, which captured Carthage

[1] See pp. 359–360.

German Kingdoms and the Roman Empire, 525 A.D.

and put an end to the Vandal kingdom. For a time almost all North Africa was again incorporated in the Roman Empire. Next, Justinian sent Belisarius into Italy to destroy the power of the Ostrogoths. Here more stubborn and more protracted fighting occurred, but eventually the Ostrogothic kingdom was overthrown, and Italy, like Africa, was restored to the Empire. Justinian

JUSTINIAN AND HIS COURT

A mosaic from the church of San Vitale at Ravenna, showing the Emperor accompanied by officers of his court and army (on the left) and by the bishop of Ravenna (Maximian) and his clergy (on the right). Justinian was present at the dedication of the church.

also sent expeditions against the Visigoths in Spain, but there he had to be content with the reconquest of the southeastern corner of the peninsula. It is regrettable that in his later years Justinian became very jealous of Belisarius and ill-treated the brave and generous soldier who had done so much to reëstablish the territory and prestige of the Roman Empire.

Revival only Temporary. — Britain, Gaul, and the greater part of Spain were not regained for the Roman Empire by Justinian or

any of his successors at Constantinople; these provinces remained respectively in the hands of Anglo-Saxons, Franks, and Visigoths. Even North Africa and Italy, which were recovered by Justinian, did not remain long thereafter under Græco-Roman sway. It is true that neither the kingdom of the Vandals nor that of the Ostrogoths was revived, but both North Africa and Italy were too distant from Constantinople and by this time were too used to separate existence to render it easy for a government of an Empire which had become largely Greek in language and culture to exercise dominion over them. And the immediate successors of Justinian were no such able Emperors as he had been, and they had no Belisarius.

Final Loss of Italy and Africa. — Italy was invaded from the north by another German people — the Lombards[1] — in the latter half of the sixth century. The Lombards were fiercer and less civilized than the Ostrogoths had been. They established a kingdom which definitely and finally ended the ancient Roman Empire in the greater part of the peninsula. Thenceforth the city of Rome was outside of the Roman Empire. Africa, as we shall see presently, fell an easy prey, in the seventh century, to the Arabs.

The Pressure on the Empire from the East: Asiatic Nomads, Slavs, and Persians

Nomads of Central Asia. — Probably the strangest people whom we meet in history are the nomads of Central Asia. For countless centuries they have frequented the vast area which covers southwestern Siberia, Mongolia, Turkestan (Russian and Chinese), and northeastern Persia, and their manner of life has always been conditioned by the physical character of this vast area.

The central portion (east of the Caspian Sea and extending across Turkestan into Mongolia) is a sandy desert, totally unfit for habitation except in a few cases. The northern portion, including the steppes (or plains) of Siberia, is well watered and capable of feeding numerous herds in summer, but it affords no pasturage in winter owing to the deep snow and icy coldness. On the other

[1] See p. 444.

hand, the southern portion, which is rich in salt, can be utilized in the winter but is uninhabitable in the summer, except on the mountains, on account of extreme heat and scarcity of water.

Consequently, the people who frequent this area are unable to settle down in any one place and engage in ordinary, peaceful planting and harvesting of crops. They cannot own or work farms. They have to depend for their living upon the rearing of horses and sheep, and to maintain these animals they have to migrate every year from north to south and back again. A nomad family of five persons will own, on the average, five oxen, twenty-five sheep, and fifteen horses; a wealthy nomad may possess as many as 20,000 horses and still more sheep. The usual wanderings of all the nomads are quite regular; each family has its accustomed place for summer pasturage and a similarly definite place for the winter; and back and forth they all go, driving thousands upon thousands of animals. In some extreme cases the summer pasturage is a thousand miles distant from the winter pasturage, so that each year these nomads must cover two thousand miles with all their herds, with their families and all their belongings.

The Mongol Type. — People who live such an existence are naturally very primitive and very hardy. From time immemorial the nomads of Central Asia have been of the so-called Mongol type — short, thick-set, bronzed and round-headed, with piercing black eyes set wide apart and obliquely, with flat noses, and with stiff, coarse, coal-black hair — and they have spoken various dialects of a language (the Turanian) which is quite different from the Chinese and Japanese languages of eastern Asia and also from the Aryan languages of Europe and India.

Customs of the Nomads. — For centuries, too, they have had certain peculiar customs and habits. They are splendid and daring riders and fighters, brave and resourceful, accustomed to pain and hardship, and at times given to ferocity and cruelty. Their dwellings are tents which they carry with them on their wanderings; their diet is chiefly mare's milk; and they clothe themselves mainly in skins, leather, and felt. Woman occupies a very inferior position among them: she must take down the tent, pack it up, load it on the oxen and horses, and again unload and

pitch it; she must make leather, felt, leather bottles, cords, waterproof material, and colors from various plants; she must spin and weave wool and hair; she must care for the children and make clothes and prepare food for the family; she must saddle and bridle horses, milk the sheep, and graze the herds in the night. The husband watches the herds only by day, and in addition only milks the mares; his remaining occupation is almost entirely war and plundering. To share the domestic work would be for a Mongol father an unheard-of humiliation. The old religion of these people was a degraded sort of ancestor-worship, with a class of priests (or shamans) who imagined that by beating a drum they could call up helpful or hurtful spirits. Of course none of the nomads could read or write, but they were shrewd in horse-trading and expert in robbing and fighting.

Families, Clans, Tribes, and Hordes. — Their social and political organization was (and is) extremely simple: six to ten related families form a camp, which wanders together, the leader of a camp being the eldest member of that family which possesses most animals; several camps make a clan; several clans form a tribe; and in times of unrest great "hordes" appear as a combination of tribes under a specially gifted or powerful leader (called a khan). Few hordes have lasted long; they are merely temporary associations and they tend to break up as soon as the need which gave rise to them has been met, though sometimes the name of a khan has been adopted and subsequently used by all the conglomerate tribesmen who once followed his leadership.

The Nomad Menace. — The Mongol nomads have always supplemented the income from their herds by plunder of surrounding country, and their wealthier and more civilized neighbors have suffered continually and often grievously from the exactions and destructions of the nomads. One recurring fact has rendered the nomads throughout history a particularly terrible menace to other peoples. This fact is that from time to time drought has occurred and they have failed to find pasturage in their homelands. At such times they have sought new areas for pasture and plunder by wandering far afield, and in the course of such extraordinary wanderings they have become a terror, now to the Chinese to the

east of them, now to the Hindus and Persians to the south of them, now to the Slavs to the northwest of them, and now to the Germans and Romans to the west of them.

The Huns. — It was a horde of Mongol nomads which, failing usual pasturage in southern Siberia, turned westward in the latter part of the fourth century A.D. and descended with fury upon the German Ostrogoths north of the Black Sea. Among this horde were Huns and Alans and doubtless other tribes whose names we do not know; all of them are usually described as Huns. We have already seen how the migration of the Hunnish horde unsettled not only the Ostrogoths but all the German tribes directly north of the Danube and the Rhine and drove them on into the Roman Empire. The Huns eventually established themselves in the plains of Hungary and from there, as a center, they proceeded to ravage all central Europe, exterminating or expelling or enslaving the natives and harrying the surrounding peoples.

Attila. — The leader (or khan) of the Huns in the first half of the century was Attila (ăt′ĭ-lȧ). He was hideous to look upon, short, broad-shouldered, with big head, flat nose, and scanty beard. He was covetous, vain, and superstitious, but cunning, audacious, and skilled equally in the arts of fighting and in those of diplomacy. He was a despotic conqueror who aimed primarily at plunder and destruction, and such a devastating tornado did he turn loose on Europe that he was nicknamed alike by German and by Roman the "Scourge of God." For many years he dominated most of Europe, and the Roman Empire sought to save itself from his wild warriors by paying him tribute. Perpetually he was asking for more, and on one occasion he got an increase of tribute by invading Greece, as far as Thermopylæ, and Thrace up to the very walls of Constantinople.

The Battle of Châlons. — When, in 451, the Emperor refused to pay tribute any longer, Attila put the Hunnish horde in motion against the Empire. His army, estimated at half a million and including troops from subjugated German tribes, set out from Hungary, crossed the Rhine, and invaded Gaul. Near Châlons (shä′-lôn′) on the Marne River he met a combined army of Romans and Visigoths and after a stubborn struggle and immense losses

on both sides he was defeated and withdrew from Gaul. The battle of Châlons saved western Europe from the Huns.

Attila in Italy. — The next year Attila invaded Italy with fire and sword, but when he neared Rome he was so impressed with the bishop (Pope Leo I), who came out to plead with him, that he spared the Eternal City and retired to Hungary. There he died in 453 while he was celebrating his wedding with a German maiden.

The Huns Settle Down. — Soon after the death of Attila, the Hunnish horde dissolved. His too numerous sons quarreled over the heritage; thousands of nomads were killed in the ensuing civil strife; and the survivors gradually assumed a settled and more civilized life and intermingled with other peoples on the lower Danube and in southern Russia. The Mongol nomads who had been embraced in Attila's Hunnish horde were gone almost as quickly as they had come, but their devasting work was accomplished: they had scourged Germans and Romans and had been the indirect cause of the establishment of German kingdoms on the soil of the Roman Empire.

The Slavs. — Germans and Romans were not the only people affected by the Hunnish horde of Asiatic nomads in the fourth and fifth centuries. The Slavs (slävz) were affected too. These people — the Slavs — had their earliest-known homes in east-central Europe, particularly in the region just east of the present state of Poland. They lived in huts, planted crops, raised bees and swine, and engaged in fishing and hunting; they were fond of music and impatient of authority; and their religion was a pagan polytheism. They were certainly on a higher cultural level than the Mongol nomads, but they were quite as primitive and barbarous as the northern Germans.

Slavic Migrations. — For some time the Slavs had suffered from the Germans. The latter people, represented by such tribes as the Goths, had pressed the Slavs on the west and on the south; and so many Slavs were captured by the Germans and sold to the Romans that the Latin (and English) word "slave" was derived from "Slav." In the fifth century, however, when Ostrogoths and Vandals and many another German tribe had been dislocated by

THE ROMAN EMPIRE, 600 A.D.

the fierce Asiatic nomads, and then when these nomads had quickly spent themselves, it became possible for the Slavs to expand southward and westward. Areas in central Europe which had recently been German now became Slavic; and, what is even more significant, lands north of the Danube, vacated by Germans, began to fill up with Slavic tribes. In some instances the migrating Slavs coöperated with the Mongols and later absorbed many of the nomads.

The Slavs in the Balkans. — The barbarous Slavs, once they were on the Danube, pressed violently against the eastern provinces of the Roman Empire. Commencing in the sixth century, they invaded Macedonia and brought a new terror to the provincials and to the Emperor in his capital at Constantinople. Justinian had to wage war against them, and shortly after his death they overran all Greece. Gradually, in the course of the seventh century, Slavs settled permanently throughout the whole of the Balkan Peninsula and came to comprise a large fraction of the subjects of the Roman Empire in its eastern European provinces. Some of the Slavs (those in Greece, for example) adopted the Greek language, just as many of the Germans in the West learned Latin. Others (notably the Serbs) retained their original speech (like the Anglo-Saxon Germans in Britain). One interesting group of Slavs was subjugated in the seventh century by a ferocious tribe of Mongol nomads, the Bulgarians, who swept around north of the Caspian and Black seas, like the Huns two centuries earlier, and settled south of the lower Danube in the Roman province of Mœsia; these Bulgarians soon fused with the conquered Slavs and acquired their language, but, like the Franks in Gaul, the nomads gave their own name to the country and its people.

The Roman Empire in the 7th Century. — The Roman Empire, in the seventh century, was greatly reduced. Its former western provinces of Gaul, Britain, and Spain were now the seats of German kingdoms (Frank, Anglo-Saxon, and Visigoth). Italy had just been the scene of fresh German invasions and become the home of a new and independent Lombard kingdom. The eastern provinces in Europe (Illyria, Macedonia, Greece, etc.) were being overrun by Slavs, and the Emperor at Constantinople was having all he could

do to prevent them from establishing separate kingdoms of their own. He managed to exercise some authority over southeastern Europe by taking Slav chieftains (or "kings") into his employ and using their warriors in his army. It was in the seventh century, moreover, that the former African and most of the Asiatic provinces were finally lost to the Roman Empire.

The Persians. — The easternmost provinces (those in Mesopotamia and Armenia) had long been troubled by warfare between the Romans and the Persians. The latter people were not a savage people like the Mongol nomads nor a barbarous people like the Germans or the Slavs; they were a people whose history and civilization reached farther back than Rome's. In fact, the only highly civilized country with which the Romans came in contact and which they did not or could not annex to their empire was Persia. Long, long ago Persia had been conquered by Alexander the Great, and for a time (323–170 B.C.) it had been ruled by his Greek successors. About 170 B.C. however, it had freed itself from Greek domination and thenceforth preserved its independence, first as the Parthian Empire under the Arsacid (är-săs'ĭd) dynasty (170 B.C.–226 A.D.) and then as a truly Persian Empire under the Sassanid (să-săn'ĭd) dynasty (226–651). It had to defend itself against the Asiatic nomads to the east and the Roman Empire to the west.

Wars between Persia and Rome. — The age-old rivalry between Romans and Persians, dating from the time of Sulla and Pompey, was intensified in the fifth and sixth centuries by a sharp religious cleavage. The Sassanid Kings in Persia were particularly zealous in support of Zoroastrianism,[1] the ancient national religion; they made it their state religion, maintaining its temples and priests at public expense and obliging all Persians to conform to it. On the other hand, Christianity had lately become the state religion of the Roman Empire, and the Emperors of the fifth and sixth centuries were anxious that all their subjects should be Christian. The wars between Persia and the Roman Empire, originating in territorial and commercial disputes, now assumed a religious character and became more frequent and more destruc-

[1] See pp. 93, 355.

tive. It was a great misfortune that Justinian and other Roman Emperors of the period felt themselves obliged to fight the Persians to the east of them at the very time when they should have concentrated their efforts on repelling the invasions of Germans, Slavs, and Asiatic nomads from the north. But the Persian wars continued, growing more frequent and more destructive.

Conquests of Chosroës. — Finally, at the beginning of the seventh century, the Persian King, Chosroës II (kŏs-rō′ēz), knowing that the Roman Empire was hard pressed by Germans in western Europe and by Slavs and nomads in eastern Europe, marshalled all his forces against it and won a series of brilliant successes. His armies conquered Mesopotamia and Armenia and advanced into Syria. They took Antioch and Damascus. In 614 they besieged and captured Jerusalem. The following year they overran Asia Minor and encamped opposite Constantinople. In 619 Chosroës carried the war into Egypt and occupied Alexandria.

The Persians Repelled. — The Roman Emperor at Constantinople at this time was Heraclius (hĕr′ȧ-klĭ′ŭs), a brave man and experienced general, but even Heraclius was now so shaky that he proposed in despair to abandon his capital and seek a refuge in Carthage. At the entreaty of the Patriarch of Constantinople, however, Heraclius took courage and resolved to fight. By borrowing money from the Church and securing soldiers from the Slavs and nomads, he was enabled to take the field against the Persians — with surprising results. He recovered Asia Minor, penetrated into Armenia, and won a great victory in Mesopotamia. At this point a revolution occurred in Persia, Chosroës was dethroned, and his successor made peace with Heraclius. The former boundaries were restored; and the Roman Empire regained its provinces of Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt.

Effect of Persian Wars. — This last terrible conflict in the East between the Persians and the Romans, with its alternating military successes and defeats, had even more terrible consequences. It so weakened both Persia and the Roman Empire that neither was able to resist the attacks, a few years later, of another and less civilized people — the Arabs. This event is so important that we shall say more about it a little later.

The Conversion of the Germans to Christianity

A New Test of Christianity. — Christianity was the dominant religion throughout the Roman Empire before the great German invasions of the fifth century which we have described in the first section of the present chapter. The coming of the "barbarians" in force and the establishment by them of independent kingdoms constituted a severe test of the new religion. Would it be accepted by the Germans as it had been by the Romans?

The Work Largely of Christian Monks. — The conversion of the Germans was achieved mainly by Christian missionaries who were monks. And before we tell the story of the conversion, we must explain who these monks were.

Early Monasticism. — Monasticism (the life of monks and nuns) appeared early in the history of Christianity. It was not peculiar to Christianity, for in the earlier religions there had been many forms of monasticism. The earliest Christian monasteries and nunneries grew up in a haphazard manner; no two were exactly alike; and serious abuses arose. Gradually, however, they were subjected to the supervision and discipline of the Church. Gradually, too, rules which had been devised by some celebrated monk for his own monastery were adopted by other monasteries, until Christian monasticism became much the same over wide areas. Thus, the Rules of Basil, a monk who lived in Asia Minor in the latter part of the fourth century, provided a common law for monasticism in the Eastern provinces of the Roman Empire, while in the West the majority of monasteries and nunneries adopted a Rule which was prepared by Benedict, a famous Italian monk, about the year 530.

Basil's Rules. — Basil decreed that his monks should live under a common roof and eat and pray together. Moreover, he opposed an earlier notion that monks should seek only their own perfection; he taught that they should serve their fellow men; they should care for the poor and for orphans, tend the sick, teach others to work, and conduct schools.

The Benedictine Rule. — Benedict had established on the summit of Monte Cassino, halfway between Rome and Naples, a

monastery with which his name has ever since been associated and which was for centuries an important center of Christian civilization in Europe. The Rule which he wrote for this monastery required that his monks, like those of Basil, should live and

THE BENEDICTINE MONASTERY OF MONTE CASSINO
Founded by Benedict in 529 A.D.

work and worship together and that each should have proper clothes, sufficient food, and ample sleep. The Rule also prescribed a certain amount of fasting, praying, and community-singing, and specified that spare time should be divided between work and reading. The "work," on which Benedict was very insistent, was ordinary farm work, but the Rule stated that the monks should do whatever work was most useful, and from the

beginning certain monks taught in a boys' school attached to the monastery.

Services to Civilization. — Benedict's rule was adopted by numerous monasteries (and nunneries) in Italy and Gaul and elsewhere throughout the West, and his followers — the Benedictine monks — did many great works during the ensuing centuries. They bore the brunt of missionary labor among the Germans, whom they not only converted but civilized. They presented object lessons in organized work, in farming, in the arts and trades, and in peaceful, well-ordered life. They also, at a time when the barbarian kingdoms neglected education, maintained schools which trained most of the priests and other learned persons and which gradually taught the Germans to write and read their own language as well as Latin. It was in Benedictine monasteries, moreover, that the writings of Latin antiquity, both pagan and Christian, were copied and preserved.

A Benedictine Monk

Barbarians and Christianity. — The conversion of the Germans to Christianity was a slow process. Doubtless many individual Germans who immigrated into the Roman Empire between the first and fourth centuries, and thus came into association with Christians, were converted to the new faith in the same way as pagan Greeks and Romans. But the wholesale conversion of the barbarous or semi-civilized Germans began only in the fourth century, and at first it was conversion to Arian Christianity.

Ulfila and the Goths. — The pioneer missionary to the Germans was Ulfila (ŭl′fĭ-lȧ, 311–383), whose grandparents had been Christians in Asia Minor and had been taken captive in a Gothic raid and carried off to lands north of the Danube. Ulfila himself was brought up as a Visigoth, and in his youth was sent either as an envoy or as a hostage to Constantinople. Here he learned Greek and Latin and accepted Arian Christianity, which at that time was

supported by the Emperor Constantius. When Ulfila was thirty years of age he was ordained a bishop by the Arians, and his labors for the conversion of the Goths covered the remaining forty years of his life. For seven of these years he preached among the Visigoths beyond the Danube, until the success of his preaching aroused the enmity of a pagan chieftain. To save his converts from persecution, and with the consent of the Emperor Constantius, he led them, "a great body of the faithful," across the Danube and settled in Mœsia. While he strengthened his companions in their new faith and taught them to read and write, he did not neglect the pagan Goths whom he had left behind. To these he sent a stream of his disciples as missionaries, so that by the time the whole tribe of Visigoths were permitted by the Emperor Valens to enter the Roman Empire (376), the bulk of them had become Arian Christians. Not least among the achievements of Ulfila was his translation of the Bible into Gothic, the first book written in a German language.

Arianism among the Germans. — Arian Christianity, accepted by the Visigoths in the fourth century, soon spread among Ostrogoths, Vandals, Burgundians, Lombards, and other German tribes, at the very time when, under the Emperor Theodosius and his successors, it was dying in the Roman Empire.[1] The result was that when, in the fifth century, Visigothic, Vandal, and Ostrogothic kingdoms were established respectively in Spain, Africa, and Italy, the king and the ruling class of Germans in each kingdom were Arian Christians, while the majority of the subject Roman population were Catholic Christians. For a century and more the hostility between the conquering Germans and the conquered Romans was intensified by religious differences.

It was for religious as well as for political reasons that the Emperor Justinian in the sixth century undertook the reconquest of Africa, Italy, and Spain. With the destruction of the Vandal and Ostrogothic kingdoms, Catholics breathed more easily for a time both in Africa and in Italy. It was not very long, however, until the Lombards established another German kingdom in Italy — and the Lombards, like the Ostrogoths, were Arians.

[1] See pp. 431–432.

Conversion of the Franks. — Meanwhile Catholic bishops in the West, especially the Pope, were engaged in peaceful proselyting work among the Germans, and in such work the bishops were powerfully aided by monks and nuns, particularly by the Benedictine monks. The Franks and the Anglo-Saxons had not become Arian; they had remained pagan; and to them the Catholic missionaries devoted themselves assiduously.

Clovis. — The conversion of the Franks proceeded slowly until the reign of Clovis (481–511). Clovis was but fifteen years of age when he became King of the Franks, but, half-barbarous and half-civilized, he showed real genius both in his youth and in his manhood. He was a born fighter and ambitious to consolidate all Gaul under his rule. He was likewise a statesman and it was under his direction that the customary law of his tribe — the Salic Law — was compiled and published in Latin. He was favorably impressed by Christianity; he always tolerated the religion of his Roman subjects; he showed great respect to bishops and monks; he married a Burgundian princess who had been converted to Catholicism. Half won over, Clovis allowed his children to be baptized, but hesitated to abjure for himself the pagan faith of his ancestors. He did not make up his mind until after a military victory over the Alemans. Then, on Christmas Day of the year 496, the King of the Franks was baptized at Rheims (rănS) with three thousand of his warriors and received into the Church. It marked the real beginning of the wholesale conversion of the Germans. As the Franks overcame the Alemans in northeastern Gaul and the Visigoths in southern Gaul, they gave their own name and their new faith to the greater part of the whole province; "Gaul" became "France"; and "France" — the dominion of the Franks — was hailed by the Popes at Rome as the "eldest daughter" of the Church.

Conversion of Spain. — If France was the "eldest daughter" of the Catholic Church, Spain was the "second daughter." The ruler of the Visigothic kingdom in Spain renounced Arianism and accepted Catholicism in the year 587.

Conversion of England. — The conversion of the Anglo-Saxons from paganism to Christianity was chiefly the outcome of the

interest and activity of Pope Gregory I (Gregory the Great), who reigned from 590 to 604. Gregory belonged to a patrician Roman family of great wealth and also of great Christian piety. He received a good education, became a lawyer, and rose to the highest civil office in his native city, the office of prefect. Then, suddenly, he laid aside ambition, put off his silk and his jewels, gave his property for the founding of monasteries and the care of the poor, and became a Benedictine monk himself. It was while he was a monk that he conceived the project of undertaking a mission to Britain. He was walking in the forum at Rome, so the story goes, when he saw some fair-haired, red-cheeked German boys: "Who are they?" he asked; "Angli (Angles)," he was told; "not Angli (Angles)," he replied, "but Angeli (Angels)." Forthwith he made plans to go to the homes of these Angles, but other cares intervened, and Gregory never went in person. Later, however, when, against his will, he was chosen Pope, he found time amidst his manifold labors to despatch to Britain a mission of Benedictine monks headed by a certain Augustine.[1]

The mission, which arrived in England in 597, was constantly watched over and counselled by Pope Gregory back in Rome; and it was immediately aided by the fact that Ethelbert, the English King of Kent, was married to a Christian Frankish princess. King Ethelbert allowed the monks to establish themselves in Canterbury, and he himself was so favorably impressed by their life and preaching that he received baptism in the same year, and his people gradually followed his example. Augustine was consecrated the first archbishop of Canterbury; and, from Kent, Christian missions were extended to the other Anglo-Saxon kingdoms. Slowly but surely the Germans in Britain abandoned paganism and adopted Christianity; the monks who converted them also civilized them; and the darkness which had enshrouded Britain since the Anglo-Saxon conquest in the fifth century was now lifted in the seventh century. The Church was organized throughout the whole country, under the general control of the Pope and the immediate

[1] This Augustine, the first archbishop of Canterbury (601–613), must not be confused with Augustine (354–430), the bishop of Hippo in Africa, mentioned on p. 437.

charge of archbishops at Canterbury and York and several bishops.

The ecclesiastical unity of the English preceded their political unity, for it was not until the ninth century that all the petty kingdoms in England were welded into one. Britain was never regained by the Roman Empire after its loss in the fifth century,

CATHEDRAL OF CANTERBURY

Built after the Norman conquest of England (see page 512) on the site of Augustine's missionary activities of the seventh century. Part of the building was reconstructed, after a fire, in 1164. From the time of Augustine to the present, Canterbury has been the seat of archbishops.

but its conversion to Christianity in the seventh century meant that Britain was recovered for Christian civilization and brought again into the main current of European history.

Celtic Christians. — The mission sent out from Rome by Pope Gregory the Great was not the only factor in the conversion of the British Isles to Christianity. Long before the landing of Augustine's mission in Kent, Christianity had been introduced into Britain by the Romans, and, though it had disappeared from

England with the advent of the Anglo-Saxons, it had been carried by Celts to their retreats in Wales and Cornwall. Thence, in the fifth and sixth centuries, it had been preached in Ireland and Scotland by such zealous missionaries as Patrick and Columba, with the result that while Christianity was winning its way with Germans in England in the seventh century, it was already

SEVENTH-CENTURY CLERGYMEN

At the left is a deacon; in the middle, a priest; and at the right, a bishop.

flourishing with Celts in other parts of the British Isles. These Celtic Christians, as well as the mission from Rome, labored for the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons.

The Celtic Christians of Wales, Ireland, and Scotland were Catholic in faith and Latin in ecclesiastical language, but some of their minor practices differed from those of the Roman mission in England. In particular, they observed Easter at a different time. Consequently, when considerable progress had been made in the

conversion of the Anglo-Saxons to Christianity, it seemed desirable to bring the usages of the Celtic Christians into complete harmony with those of the new converts. At a synod (or church assembly) held at Whitby in 664 and attended by representatives of the Celtic, English, and Roman Christians, it was decided that all should follow the papal practices. Thenceforth Christianity was as general and unified throughout the British Isles as in Gaul or Spain.

Conversion of Lombards. — In the seventh century, also, the activity of Popes and Benedictine monks in Italy resulted in the conversion of the Lombards, the last of the Arians, to Catholic Christianity. A Catholic prince succeeded to the crown of the Lombards in 626, and at the close of the century the Arian bishops in the kingdom renounced their heresy and accepted the Catholic faith.

Summary. — By the close of the seventh century Christianity had won a noteworthy victory in the re-conversion of the West — now the German West. The Germans, as well as the Romans, in Spain, Gaul, Italy, and Britain, had become solidly Christian; and outside the former boundaries of the Roman Empire Christianity had gained Ireland and Scotland and was now spreading north of the Rhine.

But while gaining ground in the West, Christianity lost ground in the East. In the East, in the seventh century, appeared a new religion, the religion of Mohammed; and Mohammedanism (or Islam, as this religion is more properly called) overwhelmed Christianity in Asia and Africa.

The Rise of Islam and the Arab Conquests

Introduction. — Two closely connected developments occurred in the eastern provinces of the Roman Empire in the seventh century. One was the invasion of a semi-civilized, semi-nomad people — the Arabs — who achieved what neither Germans nor Huns nor Slavs nor Persians had achieved: they finally deprived the Roman Empire of most of its provinces in Asia and Africa. The other was the rise of a new religion — Islam — which, adopted by the Arabs and spread by them, became a great world religion,

the rival of Christianity, and the creator of a vast new cultural area in the Near East and Middle East. So closely connected were these two developments that we must treat them together.

The Arabs. — The Arabs were (and are) a people who speak a Semitic language; that is, a language related to Hebrew. Their native land from time immemorial has been the peninsula of Arabia, with its wide deserts and its narrow strips of fertile sea-coast. Because of the nature of their homeland, most of the Arabs — all of the so-called Bedouin Arabs — have always been nomads, wandering from place to place and supporting themselves as herdsmen and plunderers. What has already been said of the Mongol nomads of Turkestan holds true, in the main, of the Bedouin Arabs.

Not all Arabs, however, are nomads; some, in very early times, lived in towns and villages along the eastern shore of the Red Sea and around the Persian Gulf and engaged in agriculture or in trade with the other Semitic speaking peoples in Syria and Mesopotamia. These settled Arabs were not highly civilized in the first centuries of the Christian era; they had no literature and little art or learning, and what writing they did was for purely business purposes.

Causes of Arab Migrations. — The Arabs, living much the same sort of life as the Mongol nomads, faced similar problems and presented to civilized neighbors a similar menace. A Bedouin camp or clan, in order to supplement the precarious income from its herds, would raid nearby agricultural communities, or waylay commercial caravans, or fight (for money) in behalf of some ambitious chieftain or grasping trader. Under such conditions, not much peace or order could exist in Arabia. And then, if a succession of bad seasons came, and pasturage and crops alike failed, or if the Bedouins pressed too continuously and too harshly upon the settled Arabs, a considerable number of fierce, hungry tribesmen would migrate from Arabia into Syria or Egypt or Mesopotamia.

Early Arab Raids. — In the early centuries of the Christian era, Arabs made several incursions into the southeastern provinces of the Roman Empire, but they wrought at that time no such havoc

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

ARABS IN THE DESERT

From a modern painting

as did the Mongols. The Arabs were fewer in numbers; their needs were less imperative; they failed utterly to hold together in a "horde" or to assail the Empire in a mass; and the Roman provincials experienced no serious difficulty in arresting or settling small and detached bands of raiders.

Islam and Arab Unity. — In the seventh century, however, the Arabs found in Islam a religious bond which gave them both spiritual and military unity, something which they had never had before and which the more numerous nomads of Turkestan still lacked. With this religious bond the Arab invasions of the seventh century assumed a far more significant aspect. The Arabs not only invaded the Roman Empire — the Mongol nomads had done that — but they remained and built a state half political and half religious.

Life of Mohammed. — Islam, or Mohammedanism as it is commonly named by Christians, originated with Mohammed, who was born at Mecca, about 570 A.D., of a fairly well-to-do family of settled Arabs. He was reared by an uncle, and brought up in the religion of his people, which was a crude paganism, with many gods (including Allah, the chief god), and with a local sanctuary, known as the Kaba (Cube), to which pilgrims came from all over Arabia in order to venerate a certain black stone. Mohammed married and probably engaged in agriculture and commerce. He could not read or write and it is doubtful whether he travelled very much; he certainly was not well acquainted with the larger world outside of Arabia. We do not know how he became interested in religion, but he lived in a region which was frequented by Jews and into which Christianity was beginning to penetrate, and it is possible that discussion of the contrast between these religions and the religion of his native town may have started him upon his career. At any rate, when he was in middle age, he convinced some of his relatives and associates that he was a Prophet, divinely appointed to reveal God's will. Mohammed never claimed to be God; he insisted only that he was the last and greatest of the prophets through whom God had spoken.

The Koran. — Throughout his public career, which lasted until his death in 632, Mohammed had numerous visions and trances.

On such occasions he would feel himself guided by God and would dictate communications of a mystic sort on a great variety of topics. The communications were written down by his friends, and after his death they were collected and published in a book called the Koran. The Koran is in the form of utterances by God himself, and it is as holy a book to Moslems as is the Bible to Christians. The Koran also marks the beginning of Arabic literature.

Mohammedan Doctrines. — The religious teachings of Mohammed, as embodied in the Koran, are chiefly these: First, monotheism of the severest type is insisted upon. There is one God (Allah), not many (as the pagans said), and not three-in-one (as Christians said), but one and only one. This one God is all-powerful, all-wise, and all-merciful; he is the God of the Jews and of the Christians; and he has revealed himself through the old Jewish prophets, then through Jesus, and finally through Mohammed. Jesus, according to Mohammed, was truly a prophet but he was not crucified and did not rise from the dead or ascend into heaven.

Future Life. — Secondly, the immortality of the soul is affirmed, with eternal damnation and fiery torments for the faithless and for evildoers and with eternal happiness for the righteous faithful. As Mohammed borrowed his monotheism from Judaism, so he seems to have derived his general notion of the hereafter from Christianity, with this difference, however, that happiness in his heaven was to consist mainly of physical pleasures.

Morality. — Thirdly, morality is stressed. Though Mohammed addressed himself to Arabs, just as Jesus had addressed himself to Jews, both teachers put forward moral precepts which were applicable to all manner of men; and thus Mohammed, like Jesus before him, provided an ethical code for a world religion rather than for a tribal religion. Mohammed's code embodies the Ten Commandments of Judaism; and in certain other respects it resembles Christian ethics, particularly in its emphasis upon the duty of forgiving injuries instead of avenging them. It especially forbade the drinking of wine. In many respects Mohammed's code is less elevating than Christ's: polygamy is permitted; women are not especially honored and their position is not much better under Islam than under the older Arabian paganism; slavery is

accepted and even encouraged; and the faithful are bidden to spread Islam by the sword.

Worship. — Fourthly, and finally, certain acts of worship are enjoined: (1) recitation of the creed, "there is no god but God (Allah) and Mohammed is His Prophet"; (2) individual prayer five times a day and special public prayers on Fridays; (3) fasting from sunrise to sunset during one month of every year; (4) giving of alms; and (5) pilgrimage to Mecca, which is to be performed by every Moslem "if he is able." The pilgrimage to Mecca, which concludes with the kissing of the black stone in the Kaba, is obviously borrowed from Arab paganism. In praying, moreover, every Moslem, wherever he may be, turns in the direction of Mecca, as the Holy City of the Prophet, although Mohammed at first prescribed that the person praying should turn toward Jerusalem. In general, it may be said that the simplicity of worship and organization which Mohammed found in the Arab paganism of his own day, he bestowed upon his new religion. For Islam, unlike Judaism and Catholic Christianity, has never developed an elaborate ritual or a priestly hierarchy. In public worship, there are very few ceremonies — only prayer, readings from the Koran, and a sermon.

Meaning of Islam. — Such, in brief outline, are the religious teachings of Mohammed. It is customary for us in America and Europe to call the religion which he founded "Mohammedanism" and to refer to his disciples as "Mohammedans," but these words were not used by Mohammed and are disliked by his followers. They call their religion "Islam" (which means "surrender") and describe themselves as "Moslems" (that is, "persons who surrender"). Anyone who surrenders himself to the Will of God and accepts Mohammed as God's last and greatest prophet, is a Moslem, a member of Islam.

The Hegira. — The first Moslems were a small secret sect, recruited from the Prophet's relatives and personal associates. Gradually, as they converted others, Mohammed abandoned secrecy, and publicly urged all his fellow townsmen to desist from the worship of idols and to accept Islam. He was not immediately successful. The majority of Meccans turned against him, and

in 622 he and his disciples fled and sought refuge in another Arab town — the town of Medina (mă-dē′nä). It was the turning point in the history of Mohammed and Islam, for the people of Medina accepted the new religion and made its Prophet their political governor as well as their religious leader; and from Medina as a center Mohammed spread Islam. The year 622 — the year of the flight (Hegira) from Mecca to Medina — became year 1 in the Moslem calendar.

Mohammed at Medina. — At Medina Mohammed used his religious influence to build up a strong government: he issued laws as if they came direct from God, administered justice, and created an enthusiastic and even fanatical army, by means of which he kept order in the town, curbed dissenters (especially the Jewish colony in Medina), repelled raiding Bedouins, and attacked and robbed caravans in the neighborhood. Attacks on caravans had two immediate results: they relieved the economic needs of the Moslems and they spread the fame and fear of Mohammed farther and farther throughout Arabia. In 630 the Meccans surrendered to an attacking Moslem force and adopted Islam; and at the time of the death of the Prophet, two years later, Islam was making its way rapidly among the settled tribes and also among the Bedouins.

The Caliphs. — After the death of Mohammed, his disciples established the office of Caliph (Representative of the Prophet) and elected to it, in succession, (1) Abu Bekr (ä′bōō-bĕk′r, 632–634), the Prophet's father-in-law and closest friend; (2) Omar (634–644), an early convert and able organizer; (3) Othman (644–655), a member of the aristocratic Omayyad (ō′mā-yăd) family of Mecca, which at first had opposed Mohammed; and (4) Ali (655–661), the son-in-law of the Prophet. These Caliphs resided at Medina and were at once the religious heads of Islam and the political and military rulers of the Arab state founded by Mohammed. Their government was essentially a theocracy, that is, a government combining state and church. The Caliphs of Medina ensured the loyalty of Arab tribesmen by punishing raids on Moslems in Arabia and by organizing piratical expeditions against non-Moslems in Syria, Mesopotamia, and Egypt. Thereby the Arabs learned to

subordinate themselves to a common religious and political dictator, and at the same time they satisfied their economic needs by making war upon the wealthier and more civilized Empires of the Romans and Persians.

Weakness of Older Empires. — These Empires were racked at the time by internal strife, and their military and financial power was sadly weakened by the long and terrible war which had recently been waged between them.[1] In addition, the Roman Emperor was confronted with Slavic invasions in Macedonia, close to Constantinople. No wonder that he could not stop Arab raids in his distant southeastern provinces.

Arab Conquests. — Rapidly the organized Arab Moslems turned their raids into conquests, and the little state of Medina soon expanded into a Moslem Arab Empire. Damascus was captured in 635; an army of the Emperor Heraclius was decisively beaten in the following year; and the Roman provincials in Syria, left to themselves, put up a resistance only in fortified cities. Jerusalem surrendered to the Arabs in 638, and Cæsarea, the last stronghold of the Roman Empire in Syria, capitulated in 640.

From Syria the conquering Arabs advanced both north and south. To the north they invaded and appropriated Armenia. To the south they overran Egypt, finally securing Alexandria in 646. They fitted out a fleet of warships and won their first naval success by capturing Cyprus in 649. From Egypt, Arab land forces pushed farther and farther westward, through Tripoli, Tunis, Algeria, and Morocco: they ended Roman rule in North Africa, converted Berber and Moorish tribesmen to Islam, and used these new converts to maintain and strengthen the Arab Empire along the Mediterranean.

Arab Invasion of Spain and France. — In 711 an expedition of Berbers and Moors, under Arab leaders, crossed the Strait of Gibraltar[2] and overthrew the kingdom of the Visigoths.[3] Establishing their sway over the whole Spanish peninsula (except the

[1] See pp. 460–461.

[2] The Arab commander was Tarik, from whom the Strait of Gibraltar derived its name. It had formerly been called the Straits of Hercules. Gibraltar means, in Arabic, "Gebel Tarik," or, in English, "Mount Tarik."

[3] See. pp. 445–446, 449, 452, 466.

mountainous northwestern corner), the Moslems next crossed the Pyrenees and descended upon southern France. Near the city of Tours in the year 732 — exactly one hundred years after the death of Mohammed — the Frankish Christian leader, Charles Martel, met the oncoming Moslems and decisively defeated them. The western limit of Arab and Moslem expansion was fixed at the Pyrenees.

THE BATTLE OF TOURS, 732 A.D.

A modern imaginative picture of the famous contest between Christians and Moslems for the control of France.

Conquest of Persia. — Meanwhile, other Arab troops had invaded the Persian Kingdom and in 637 at Kedessia (kĕ-dĕs′sĭ-ȧ) won a decisive victory which gave them the valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates. Thence, carrying the war into Persia proper, they overcame stubborn resistance, deposed the Sassanid dynasty, and mastered the whole country (about 650).

The Arab Empire. — From Persia the Moslem tide flowed eastward, until by 732, the hundredth anniversary of the death of Mohammed, the Arab Moslem Empire extended from the Pyrenees in western Europe, through Spain, across northern Africa, through Syria and Armenia and Mesopotamia and Persia, and on through Central Asia, to the very frontiers of China and India. Such an Empire, the greatest in territorial extent so far in the world's history, embraced many different nationalities and languages and religions, but the core of it was Arab and Moslem. The Moslem Arabs, originally confined to Arabia, were now scattered far afield — some as soldiers extending the dominion of the Caliphs in Africa and Asia, more as settlers following in the wake of the victorious armies and establishing themselves as officials and traders and farmers throughout the huge new Empire. Particularly into Syria and Mesopotamia, where the majority of the natives still spoke kindred Semitic languages, came large numbers of Arab immigrants, bringing their new religion and a happy faculty of adapting themselves quickly to their new environment. Before the death of the fourth Caliph (661), it was already apparent that Medina and Mecca, and Arabia itself, were but outposts of Arab power and influence and that the real centers of the Moslem Empire were Syria and Mesopotamia. The Caliph Ali preferred Mesopotamia, and his successor, the fifth Caliph and the founder of the so-called Omayyad dynasty, definitely and finally removed the capital from Medina to Damascus in Syria. At Damascus the Omayyad Caliphs reigned as spiritual and temporal overlords of their extensive Empire from 661 to 749.

Toleration of Other Religions. — Neither the Caliphs at Medina nor those at Damascus attempted to destroy the civilization of the lands they occupied or to uproot existing religions. With the exception of religion and language, they gave far less to their conquered peoples than they received. They merely put their government and language and religion on top of the Christian and Zoroastrian and pagan civilizations. In religion they were surprisingly tolerant; they did not force their subjects to accept Islam, and they actually protected heretics against orthodox intolerance.

A View of Damascus

Showing the chief mosque which the Moslems erected there.

Converts to Islam. — Nevertheless, after the establishment of the Arab Empire, Islam gained a multitude of converts, and from being a purely tribal Arab religion, it now became an international world religion, for the bulk of the inhabitants of Syria and northern Africa abandoned Christianity and adopted Islam.

They did so for numerous reasons. Some were tired of the chronic and bitter disputes concerning the founder of Christianity — whether he had one nature or two natures, and one will or two wills — and the simpler and less mysterious creed of Islam appealed to them. Others felt that the moral teachings of Mohammed were more practical than those of Jesus. Others believed that Islam was more tolerant and "broad-minded" than Christianity. Still others wished to curry favor with the Moslem conquerors.

Finally, the Arab rulers, while tolerating Christianity, held out substantial inducements to their Christian subjects to become Moslems; important offices in the Empire could be held only by Moslems, and taxes were paid only by non-Moslems. In other words, the Christian who became a Moslem ceased to pay taxes and at the same time might hold the highest office in the state. We are told that the Caliphs at Damascus were soon alarmed by the enormous rush of Christians into Islam, for it threatened to deprive the Moslem Empire of its chief revenues and reduce it to bankruptcy.

Christian Communities. — Some Christian communities survived in the Arab Empire. The Armenians clung to Christianity and never accepted Islam. The Romans and Visigoths in Spain remained largely Christian and Catholic. Even in Egypt, Syria, and Mesopotamia, remnants of Christian churches endured. With these exceptions, the formerly Christian populations of the Arab Empire were now Moslem.

Conversion of Persia. — Most of the reasons which explain the conversion of Christians to Islam explain likewise the conversion of Zoroastrians to Islam, and before long the Persians were overwhelmingly Moslem. A few Zoroastrians have lingered on in Persia to the present day, and a somewhat larger number emigrated to India, where their descendants (called Parsees) still live. The triumph of Islam in Persia was complete, but it had its

drawbacks, for thereafter the Arabs, who had built up the Moslem Empire, had to divide its leadership with the Persians, and, as we shall see later, it was by Moslem Persians that the Arab Empire was eventually destroyed.

Arab Civilization. — In the meantime the Arabs were becoming settled and civilized in their new environment, especially in Syria.



MOSQUE OF OMAR AT JERUSALEM

Built by the Moslems in the seventh century on the foundations of the Hebrew Temple of Solomon.

They were ready learners, and, combining what they learned of the arts and sciences from the more civilized Christians and ex-Christians with what they brought with themselves from Arabia — their religion and their enthusiasm — they constructed a great Arab civilization which came in time to vie with the ancient civilizations and with contemporary Christian civilization. This rising Arab civilization gradually affected the whole Moslem world and created a common cultural area of the Near East and Middle East — the area between Christendom in the West and India and China

in the Far East; but it had its cradle and permanent home in Syria. There the most stately buildings were erected, such as the Omar mosque in Jerusalem, and the Omayyad mosque in Damascus. Arab literature, particularly poetry, began to flourish at the brilliant court of the Omayyad Caliphs at Damascus. Guided by Christian learning, Arab science commenced to appear.

Summary. — The Arab invasions and migrations of the seventh century marked the culmination of three centuries of barbarian incursion into the Christian Roman Empire — by Germans, Huns, Slavs, Persians, and finally Arabs. By the seventh century the Germans had ended Roman rule in Italy, Gaul, Britain, and Spain, and the Arabs had ended it in Syria, Mesopotamia, Armenia, Egypt, and Africa. When the invasions began, the whole Roman Empire had recently turned from Græco-Roman paganism to Christianity, and pagan civilization was being transformed into Christian civilization in all the Mediterranean lands. When the invasions reached their height, Christianity was supplanting German paganism in Europe and spreading its own type of civilization among the Celts, Germans, Huns, and Slavs, but at the same time Christianity was being supplanted in Asia and Africa by Islam, and a new Moslem civilization was spreading among the Arabs and Persians as well as among the former Roman provincials in the East. What had been a unified Mediterranean world, first under a pagan Roman Empire and then under a Christian Roman Empire, was now being broken into two worlds — the Western world of Christianity and the Eastern world of Islam. Yet the Eastern world of Islam would not and could not have been the civilized world it was if it had been builded exclusively on the religion and institutions of barbarous Arab invaders; it was builded in part upon these, but also in part upon the art and learning of generations of settled and civilized Christians and Pagans.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. By way of review, make a list of barbarian invasions that disturbed the civilizations of antiquity: Egypt, Babylonia and Assyria, Crete, Greece, India, China, Etruria, Rome. Can you think of any reason or reasons why powerful and wealthy civilized states should have been so generally subject to barbarian invasions? Did barbarian invasions

always mean a severe and permanent setback to civilization? Can you think of any instances in which the barbarians had something to contribute to progress?

2. Give the names of the chief German tribes and the areas inhabited by them in the fourth century; and describe their social, economic, and political institutions. Can you see any points of comparison between them and the early Greeks, Aryans, and Iranians?

3. In what ways did Germans enter the Roman Empire before 378?

4. Trace on the map the migrations of the Visigoths, the Vandals, Sueves, and Alans, the Alemans, Burgundians, and Franks, the Saxons, Angles, and Jutes, and the Ostrogoths.

5. In what respects, and to what degree, did the establishment of German kingdoms in Western Europe mean a lowering of civilization in this region? Locate these kingdoms on the map.

6. Referring to Chapters XI and XIII, as well as to XIV, give an account of the career and achievements of the Emperor Justinian. How successful were his efforts to reunite and strengthen the Empire?

7. Describe the economic and social institutions of the nomads of Central Asia and explain the reason for their invasion of Europe. What other region studied in an earlier chapter was frequently invaded by these nomad barbarians?

8. Trace the migrations of the Slavs in Eastern Europe? What was the effect of these migrations on the Roman Empire?

9. Referring to Chapter XI, trace the conflicts between the Roman Empire and Persia from the second to the seventh century.

10. Describe the development of Christian monasticism. What influence did the monks have on economic conditions, education, and literature, and the conversion of the barbarians?

11. Give an account of the life and teachings of Mohammed. Compare his career and his doctrines with those of Gautama, Confucius, and Jesus.

12. Explain how Islam became the religion of the Arabs. Can you account for the success of the Arabs in establishing a great Empire?

SPECIAL TOPICS

Justinian. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. xii; Bury, *Later Roman Empire*, I, 351–358, 469–482.

Alaric. Bury, *Later Roman Empire*, I, 107–122; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, chs. xxx–xxxi.

Attila and the Huns. Robinson, *Readings*, I, 46–51; Bury, *Later Roman Empire*, I, 161–180, 213–223; Cambridge Medieval History, I, 360–366; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, chs. xxxiv–xxxv.

Life, manners, and culture in the fifth century. Bury, *Later Roman Empire*, I, 197–212; Dill, *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire*, 385–415.

The so-called fall of Rome. ROBINSON, *The New History*, ch. vi; BURY, *Later Roman Empire*, I, 274–289; GIBBON, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. xxxvi.

Gregory and the Lombards. BURY, *Later Roman Empire*, II, 145–158; FLICK, *Rise of the Mediæval Church*, 185–194; THORNDIKE, *Medieval Europe*, 154–160; CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY, II, ch. viii B.

Early monasticism. FLICK, *Rise of the Mediæval Church*, ch. xi; CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY, I, ch. xviii; TAYLOR, *Classical Heritage*, 136–154; GASQUET, *English Monastic Life*, ch. i.

Conversion of the Angles. TAYLOR, *Mediæval Mind*, I, 180–190; ROBINSON, *Readings*, I, 97–105; CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY, II, 515–532.

Theodoric. MUNRO, *Middle Ages*, 50–54; GIBBON, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. xxxix; CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY, I, ch. xv.

Roman Britain and the Anglo-Saxon Conquest. CHEYNEY, *Short History of England*, chs. iii–iv; CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY, I, ch. xiii.

Mohammed. ROBINSON, *Readings*, I, 114–120; THATCHER AND MCNEAL, *Europe in the Middle Age*, ch. xiv; CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY, II, ch. x.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THE TEACHER

L. J. PAETOW, *Guide to the Study of Medieval History*. J. W. THOMPSON, *Reference Studies in Medieval History*. D. C. MUNRO, *The Middle Ages*. L. THORNDIKE, *History of Medieval Europe*. CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY, I. F. B. GUMMERE, *Germanic Origins*. T. HODGKIN, *Italy and Her Invaders*. T. HODGKIN, *Theodoric the Goth*. C. J. H. HAYES, *Sources Relating to the Germanic Invasions*. H. GRISAR, *History of Rome and the Popes in the Middle Ages*. C. H. ROBINSON, *Conversion of Europe*. H. B. WORKMAN, *Evolution of the Monastic Ideal*. D. S. MARGOLIOUTH, *Mohammed and the Rise of Islam*. D. HOGARTH, *Arabia*. Also GIBBON, BURY, and other works as for Chapters XI and XIII

CONVENIENT SOURCE MATERIAL

J. H. ROBINSON, *Readings in European History*, I, chs. i–v. GREGORY, Bishop of Tours, *History of the Franks* (trans. by E. Brehaut). ANGLO-SAXON CHRONICLE. VENERABLE BEDE, *Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation*. PAUL THE DEACON, *History of the Langobards*. JORDANES, *Gothic History*. BOETHIUS, *Consolations of Philosophy*. THE RULE OF ST. BENEDICT (trans. by F. A. Gasquet). THE KORAN (trans. by J. M. Rodwell). S. LANE POOLE, *Speeches and Table-Talk of the Prophet Mohammed*. BALADHURI, *Origins of the Islamic State* (trans. by P. K. Hitti).

CHAPTER XV

THE DARK AGE

Cultural development in the seventh and eighth centuries was downward instead of upward. Three preceding centuries of almost continued barbarian invasion and war had produced natural results, and as a whole the Christian world of the seventh and eighth centuries was much less civilized and cultured than had been the world of Græco-Roman paganism in the first century. At least in the West, only a small minority of people could read and write; few schools existed; no masterpiece was produced in any art except, possibly, architecture; and there was no science worthy of the name. The Dark Age had begun in Western Europe, and it was to last until the eleventh century.

Yet even the Dark Age was not so dark as it has sometimes been represented. Throughout the period from the seventh to the eleventh century Constantinople remained a Christian center of civilization and culture, with a good deal of learning and with much artistic appreciation; and elsewhere, in the West as well as in the East, Christian bishops and Benedictine monks preserved old records, aroused new interests, and kept lighted the lamp of learning. It should be borne in mind, moreover, that if the culture of the Greeks and Romans deteriorated during the Dark Age, that of the Germans, Celts, and Slavs vastly improved.

Charlemagne and His Empire

The Franks. — Of all the German peoples who settled permanently within the western provinces of the Roman Empire, the Franks were the most important. They were originally a confederation of several German tribes that took possession of northwestern and central Gaul. Those who lived near the salt waters of the North Sea were called the Salian or Salic Franks; those who dwelt inland and along the rivers were called the Ripuarian Franks.

Each Frankish tribe had its own chieftain or king, but the chiefs of the Salic Franks — the kingly family of Merovius — were recognized as the commanders of the whole confederation.

The Merovingian Kings. — To the Merovingian family, as the kingly family of Merovius is commonly styled, belonged Clovis (481–511), who led the Franks against Alemans and Visigoths and extended his rule over most of Gaul, who compiled and published the Salic Laws as the legal code of the whole Frankish state, and who was the first German king to become a Catholic Christian. For a hundred years after Clovis, his Merovingian successors were active in war and religion and government; they annexed Burgundy, fostered and championed the Catholic Church, and labored for the mixing of the Franks with the original Gallic-Roman population. It was during this period that the Franks began to learn Latin and to acquire the rudiments of Roman civilization and also to give their own name to the whole country. Gaul became "Francia," or, as we say nowadays, France; and the Franks eventually became, in language and culture, a Romance[1] people.

Disunity of France. — All the Merovingian kings followed the old German custom of dividing their kingdom at their death equally among their sons, with the result that, after the death of Clovis, France was repeatedly divided and subdivided. At times one brother would get rid of the others by murder or war and would reunite the whole country; at other times brothers would coöperate and treat each other as joint rulers of a common realm; occasionally only one son would survive his father. Gradually, however, from the original kingdom of Clovis emerged the three more or less independent sub-kingdoms of Austrasia (ôs-trā′shȧ) in northeastern Gaul, Neustria (nūs′trĭ-ȧ) in western Gaul, and Burgundy, each ruled by a member of the Merovingian family.

Feuds of Nobles. — Gradually, too, fighting between members of the Merovingian family and among the sub-states of Burgundy, Neustria, and Austrasia was complicated and rendered even more dangerous by fighting among the principal Frankish warriors. These persons raised private armies of devoted personal followers, secured large agricultural estates, and set themselves up as nobles.

[1] See p. 610.

As nobles they were eager and able to restrict the power of the kings, and in so doing they added to the turbulence and disorder of the country. Under the later Merovingians, France seemed doomed to speedy dissolution.

Mayors of the Palace. — The Merovingian kings during the second century after Clovis were not strong men. They were weaklings, utterly unfit to fight or govern. They had only the sense — or the laziness — to entrust the direction of public affairs entirely to an official who was called the "Mayor of the Palace" and who was the wealthiest and most powerful noble in the realm. The later Merovingians were appropriately nicknamed the "do-nothing kings" (*rois fainéants*); their Mayors of the Palace did the fighting and governing.

Charles Martel. — Under the circumstances it was fortunate for France that some very able Mayors of the Palace appeared. One of these, originally Mayor of the Palace in Austrasia, imposed his rule on Neustria and Burgundy, became actual governor of the whole Merovingian kingdom, and passed on his authority to his son. This son, Charles Martel, was the man who fought the Moslems to a standstill at the battle of Tours (732) and saved France from Arab conquest;[1] he also extended the boundaries of his country north and east of the Rhine and promoted the conversion of the northern Germans from paganism to Christianity.

Pepin. — His son, Pepin (pĕp′ĭn) by name, was equally remarkable. Pepin continued his father's policy of extending Frankish dominion and Christianity into Germany; he repressed rebellious or unruly nobles at home, brought the Gallo-Roman population of Aquitaine (southern Gaul) into closer subjection, and gave all France an orderly government; and with the Pope he maintained relations of intimate friendship — with two outstanding results. First, the Pope decided, on Pepin's recommendation, that the man who actually governed a country should be its king instead of the man who only possessed a semblance of royalty; and following this decision, and with the Pope's blessing, Pepin deposed the last of the "do-nothing" Merovingian kings and made himself King of France (751). Secondly, King Pepin, on the Pope's entreaty,

[1] See p. 478.

intervened in Italy, prevented the Lombards from seizing Rome, and handed over to the Pope the Eternal City and the Exarchate of Ravenna[1] to be administered thenceforth as a State of the Church (756). Thus was the Pope assured a state of his own and with it political independence from Greek Emperor and Lombard kings; the so-called Donation of Pepin established the Pope's temporal power, which was to endure from 756 to 1870. The Pope of Rome was now free from the Roman Emperor, as the Patriarch of Constantinople was not.

The Carolingian Dynasty. — The change of Pepin's title from Mayor of the Palace to King established in France a new dynasty, the Carolingian dynasty,[2] which replaced the Merovingians and produced the foremost statesman of the Dark Ages. This man was Charles the Great, or, as he is usually styled, Charlemagne (shär'lē-mān). Pepin and his father, Charles Martel, were both great men; but Pepin's son Charlemagne was even greater.

Charlemagne. — Charlemagne was born about 742 and died in 814. His biographer, Einhard, describes him in later life as being big and robust in frame, nearly seven feet tall, with large and lustrous eyes, with a rather long nose, and with a ruddy and cheerful countenance. He had a commanding presence, a clear but somewhat feeble voice, and grew rather stout. His health was uniformly good, owing perhaps to his moderation in eating and drinking and to his fondness for hunting and swimming. Though given to immorality in his private life, he was a regular observer of religious rites and took deep interest in the missions and schools of the Church. Though unable to write, he knew German and learned to read Latin, and he greatly admired learning in others. Above all, Charlemagne was a great organizer and administrator, a really great statesman.

His Conquests. — Charlemagne succeeded his father, Pepin, on the throne of France in 768. At first he had to divide the kingdom

[1] The Exarchate of Ravenna was a region in Italy on the Adriatic Sea which the Roman Emperor at Constantinople had continued to rule, through a deputy (called an Exarch), after he had lost the rest of Italy.

[2] The dynasty is termed Carolingian because its kings were descendants of Charles Martel (the Latin word for Charles being Carolus).

with his brother Carloman, for the Carolingians, like the Merovingians before them, followed the custom of dividing the family inheritance, but the death of Carloman and the ousting of his sons soon enabled Charlemagne to become sole King of the Franks. He at once started on a career of conquest. He defeated and dethroned the Lombard king, annexed northern Italy, and assumed the title King of the Lombards (774). Next, he crossed the Pyrenees and attacked the Moslems in Spain, but met with reverses and was obliged to withdraw; on his return through the Pyrenees, a detachment of his troops under a certain Roland were slain, fighting valiantly, and this engagement — the so-called battle of Roncesvalles — was later utilized as the central theme of the "Song of Roland," one of the great epic poems of the Middle Age. For many years — at least thirty —

CHARLEMAGNE

A famous painting by the German artist Dürer (see page 771), who lived seven hundred years after Charlemagne and imagined that he looked like this.

Charlemagne directed his major military operations against the pagan Germans to the north and east of France; he subdued the Bavarians, the Thuringians, and the Saxons, incorporated them into his dominion, and forced their conversion to Christianity and their acceptance of law and order. He even extended his conquests and sway into Denmark and Hungary, and from the Moslems he at last captured the northeastern part of Spain down to the River Ebro.

Coronation as Emperor. — Such conquests expanded the kingdom of the Franks into a veritable empire, and the Pope at the time, Leo III, determined to recognize Charlemagne as Emperor in fact. The great event took place on Christmas Day of the year 800, when Charlemagne, on rising from prayer in St. Peter's Church in Rome, was crowned by Leo III and hailed as Emperor and Augustus amid the shouts and cheers of the crowd. Western and central Europe — France, Germany, Austria, northern Spain, and most of Italy — was thus erected into a new Christian (Holy) Roman Empire. Henceforth there were two Empires in Christendom, that of the East, with its capital at Constantinople, and that of the West, with its capital at Aix. The Eastern Empire — now almost exclusively Greek and referred to as "Byzantine" [1] — claimed to be the real and true continuation of the ancient Roman Empire and naturally resented the creation of an upstart and imitation Empire. Only in 812, and then grudgingly, did the Roman Emperor at Constantinople recognize Charlemagne as Roman Emperor of the West.

Government. — Charlemagne as Emperor continued the great work he had begun as King. He assigned the frontier provinces ("marches" or "marks"), where fighting and disorder were most prevalent, to competent military commanders styled "margraves" or "marquesses"; the rest of his dominion he divided into counties, under the civil and military administration of "counts"; and he supervised the government of counts and margraves by means of a group of traveling officials — the "*missi dominici*" — who made regular reports to him at Aix. Under Charlemagne, the popular assemblies of the Franks changed their character: no longer did the nation come together to legislate; the Emperor summoned

[1] Why it was referred to as Byzantine is explained on p. 495.

representatives of the people to assent to his acts. The laws which he issued were called "capitularies."

Civilization in France. — Charlemagne and his Empire were important in the spread of Christian-Roman civilization among the Germans. Already, Pepin's contacts with Rome had paved the way for later developments in law and likewise in literature and learning. "I send you," the Pope had written to Pepin, "all the books which could be found" — and he named textbooks and hymn books — "all written in the Greek tongue," and treatises on grammar, geometry, and writing, and the works of Aristotle. "I send too," the Pope added, "the night-clock" — doubtless an alarm-clock, such as waked the monks for early morning prayers. This epistle is but a hint of the general flow of arts and letters from Rome to France.

Charlemagne and Learning. — Charlemagne himself was a tireless patron of learning. He loved to read histories and study astronomy and question travellers about geography. He attended lectures on grammar, and his favorite book was Augustine's "City of God." He caused Frankish legends to be collected and put in poetical form. He delighted in the society of the scholars whom he found in various countries and drew to his court — as Alcuin (ăl′kwĭn) from England, Paul the Lombard, and Peter of Pisa. In this society the trappings of rank were laid aside, each scholar adopted a fanciful literary name, and the Emperor was addressed simply as "David." Under Charlemagne's guidance, Alcuin organized a "school of the palace," where the royal children were taught together with others, and likewise he founded at Tours a school which became the model for many other educational institutions throughout the Empire.

Schools and Books. — Charlemagne was unwearying in his efforts to aid the Church in its Christianizing and civilizing influence. He founded bishoprics and monasteries, was lavish in his gifts to ecclesiastical foundations, took an active part in the deliberations of church synods, and favored bishops and abbots who possessed personal piety and learning and administrative ability. To improve the education of the laity[1] as well as of the clergy, he

[1] "Laity" means all Christians who are not clergymen.

ordered (789) that schools should be established in every diocese of his Empire. The subjects taught in these schools were strictly religious, and some of the topics discussed by the professors would strike us as being silly, but the schools of Charlemagne were stepping stones to better things.

Perhaps the main achievement of the Carolingian revival in education was to restore Latin to its position as a literary language throughout the greater part of Europe, and to reintroduce a correct system of spelling and an improved handwriting. Copies of valuable books were made, and by careful comparison and criticism the texts were corrected. In Charlemagne the Benedictine monks and the Popes found a powerful German ally in the task of preserving the relics of ancient Græco-Roman culture.

Spain and Britain. — At the end of the eighth century the two Roman Empires — that of the East and that of the West — embraced most of southern and central Europe, but did not include either the British Isles or Spain.

Spain was still in the grip of its Moslem conquerors, though Charlemagne had pressed them back from the Pyrenees to the Ebro, while in the northwestern mountains the Christian Visigoths, with Charlemagne's aid, maintained a small independent state — the kingdom of the Asturias.

In the British Isles, the Celts of Ireland and Scotland were developing a relatively advanced Christian civilization and were sending missionaries far and wide among the Germans on the Continent. The Anglo-Saxons also were becoming civilized and were producing a few scholars, such as the historian Bede and the teacher Alcuin. But English progress was gravely retarded by chronic fighting among the petty kingdoms into which England was still divided. It happened that an English prince, Egbert by name, who had been exiled and had served for thirteen years as a general under Charlemagne, became King of Wessex in 802 — two years after the coronation of Charlemagne as Emperor. King Egbert by a series of campaigns established the supremacy of Wessex over all the other Anglo-Saxon kingdoms. This supremacy was afterwards maintained and led eventually to the creation of the united Kingdom of England.

The Divided Empire. — The Empire of Charlemagne was short-lived. The son and successor of Charlemagne, Louis "the Pious" (814–840), was a good man and fairly well educated, but he was no genius. The counts and dukes and margraves and other nobles were insubordinate and quarrelsome. The various parts of the Empire tended to separate. The Emperor's sons — Lothar, Louis, and Charles — defied their father and warred with one another for the partition of his inheritance.

The Strasbourg Oath. — Louis and Charles, made Kings respectively of Germany and France, took a solemn oath at Strasbourg in 842 to resist the claim of Lothar, as Emperor, to dictate to them. The Strasbourg Oath is important both for substance and for form, for Louis took it in German and Charles in French (Romance Latin). This showed that two separate languages and nationalities were emerging among the Franks and their conquered tribes.

The Treaty of Verdun. — In the following year (843) the three brothers concluded a treaty at Verdun, which actually partitioned the Carolingian Empire. Lothar retained the title of Emperor, though it was now only a title, and the kingdom of Italy, and obtained a long narrow strip of territory extending northward between the Alps and the Rhone and thence northwestward along the Rhine River to the North Sea. This strip was called Lotharingia (whence the French word "Lorraine"). Louis was recognized as King of Germany, including the lands of the Bavarians, Saxons, Thuringians, and Alemans. Charles received the original kingdom of the Franks (Neustria and Aquitaine).

End of Carolingian Empire. — The Treaty of Verdun did not establish peace or order. The three brothers and their several heirs continued to quarrel and fight; there were new partitions and new dissatisfactions; the local counts and dukes grew ever more ambitious and rebellious. The Counts of Paris actually supplanted the Carolingians as Kings of France, first in 888, and finally, under Hugh Capet (ka′pā′), in 987; and the Duke of the Saxons replaced the Carolingians in Germany in 919. To cap the climax, a new and most devastating series of barbarian invasions — this time of Scandinavians, Hungarians, and Saracens (săr′ȧ-cĕnz) — weakened and finally destroyed the Empire of Charlemagne.

CHARLEMAGNE'S EMPIRE AND ITS PARTITION BY THE TREATY OF VERDUN, 843 A.D.

Revival of Holy Roman Empire by Otto. — The Empire of Charlemagne perished in the ninth century. But the idea in back of it did not die, and in the year 962 Pope John XII crowned Otto, the Saxon King of Germany, as Holy Roman Emperor. The Western Empire, thus revived in 962, lasted until 1806, but it was never the comprehensive Empire which the ancient Roman Empire had been and it was not even so large as the Empire of Charlemagne. Otto's Empire did not include France or Spain; it was essentially a Roman Empire of the German and Italian nations. Yet it was an important institution in the history of Western Europe during the Middle Age, and we shall have occasion to discuss it in a later chapter of our story.

OTTO THE GREAT AND HIS WIFE
Statues preserved in a chapel of the Cathedral of Magdeburg.

We must now see what was happening to that other and more properly styled Roman Empire — the Roman Empire of the Byzantine Greeks.

THE BYZANTINE EMPIRE

Meaning of Byzantine. — "Byzantine" (bĭ-zăn′tĭn) refers to the Greek town of Byzantium (bĭ-zăn′shĭ-ŭm), which Constantine, the first Christian Emperor, enlarged and renamed "Constantinople" and made the capital of the Roman Empire (330).[1] From 330 to 1453 — over eleven hundred years — Constantinople, or Byzantium, remained the capital city of a long succession of Roman Emperors, and hence the Empire itself during this period is frequently called the "Byzantine" Empire — as well as the "Roman" Empire. Particularly appropriate is the word "Byzantine" to describe the Roman Empire after the time of Justinian,

[1] See p. 348.

after it had lost its Western provinces (including Rome, its original capital) and had become a contracted state of which Byzantium was the center and in which Greek, rather than Latin, was the prevailing language.

The Arab Menace. — While the Frankish state was developing in the West under the Merovingians and Carolingians and giving birth to the Empire of Charlemagne, the Roman (Byzantine) Empire in the East was struggling for its very existence. Following the loss of its West European provinces to the Germans, it lost all its African and most of its Asiatic provinces to the Moslem Arabs.[1] For a time it seemed as if the Arabs would destroy the Empire utterly; they invaded Asia Minor, fitted out warships, occupied Cyprus and Crete, and twice laid siege to Constantinople — first in 673–677, and again in 717–718. They were pressed back, however. Constantinople was saved by the resourcefulness of its Emperors, the determination of its inhabitants, the strength of its fortifications, and the assistance of its navy and of a chemical compound — "Greek fire" — which would burn on water and set fire to enemy ships. And Asia Minor, whence came the best soldiers and the chief food-supply, was successfully defended against the Arabs and preserved to the Byzantine Empire.

Slavs and Bulgars. — The Arabs were not the only external menace to the Byzantine Empire of that time. The Slavs and Bulgarians threatened it from the north and west while the Arabs threatened it from the east and south. We have already seen how, in the sixth and seventh centuries, Slavic tribes had crossed the Danube, disturbed the Empire, and finally obtained permanent settlements in the Balkan Peninsula.[2] These Yugoslavs (or "southern Slavs") were gradually converted to Christianity, civilized, and subjected to imperial rule. But they long kept their own distinct tribal laws and organization, merely paying tribute to the Emperor and furnishing him with a quota of troops; they always retained their own language and nationality, and they were ever a menace to the peace and unity of the Empire.

In the seventh century a Mongol tribe — the Bulgars — seized the province of Mœsia, conquered the Slavs who lived there,

[1] See p. 477. [2] See pp. 458–459.

established a barbarous and practically independent state, and conducted incessant raids and campaigns into the remaining provinces of the Empire. As time went on, the Bulgarians adopted the Slav speech of the conquered people among whom they now dwelt, while ancient Mœsia received the name of the conquerors and was known forever after as Bulgaria.

Bulgarian Conquests. — Early in the ninth century — while Charlemagne was Emperor in the West — the Bulgarians under their "Sublime Khan," Krum by name, and with their Slav subjects and allies, made a mighty attack upon the Eastern Empire. Krum killed one Byzantine Emperor and defeated another, and in 813 laid siege to Constantinople. Unable to take the capital, the ferocious Khan avenged himself by devastating the shores of the Hellespont and the interior of Thrace. Krum burst a blood-vessel and died in the following year, and his son concluded a treaty which divided Thrace between Bulgaria and the Empire. Thenceforth for two centuries Bulgaria was an independent and important state in southeastern Europe. Under the Khan Simeon (893–927), who warred against Greeks and Slavs and who assumed the title of Tsar (Cæsar), it became the dominant Balkan state, extending from the Black Sea to the Adriatic, blotting out the Slav states, and leaving to the Byzantine Empire only Greece and the Ægean seacoast. In the eleventh century, however, Bulgaria was overwhelmed by the Greeks and reincorporated into the Empire.

Nature of the Byzantine Empire. — The Byzantine Empire, before and after its conflicts with Bulgarians and Arabs, claimed to be, with much right, the real continuation of the ancient Roman Empire. One Emperor had succeeded another from the time of Augustus Cæsar through the eras of Constantine and Theodosius and Justinian and Heraclius and into later centuries; and the institutions and laws and customs of old Rome were still observed at Constantinople with only such change as slow and gradual development would normally involve. In this respect, the Byzantine Empire was in marked contrast to the Carolingian Empire. The former was old and continuous; the latter was new and transitory. The Pope and the Germans might dub the Empire of Charlemagne or that of Otto a Roman Empire, but Moslems

as well as Greeks and Slavs down to the present day have always identified "Roman" (or "Rum," as they call it) with "Byzantine." To Eastern Europeans and to Asiatics the Byzantine Empire was *the* Roman Empire.

On the other hand, the Byzantine Empire, after the time of Heraclius, lacked the universal character which had distinguished the earlier Roman Empire. It was no longer an Empire of innumerable races, nationalities, languages, and religions; it was mainly a state of Greek-speaking people. The fact may help to explain why the Byzantine Empire, despite the external dangers and difficulties which confronted it, displayed abiding internal strength; it was far more homogeneous and patriotic than the Empire of Charlemagne, and it lasted very much longer. Time and time again, it was defeated in war, its territory was ravaged and its capital besieged, but until its final destruction in 1453 it had an amazing faculty of saving itself at critical moments and regaining its vitality and its brilliance. Its national compactness strengthened the Byzantine Empire and prolonged its life.

The Imperial Government. — Not only were its inhabitants patriotic and its capital splendidly situated to resist capture, but the Byzantine Empire had some very remarkable rulers throughout its history. The Emperor — Basileus (bȧ-sĭ-lōōs′), as he was styled — was an autocrat: he made the laws and enforced them; he commanded the army; he appointed all officials; he levied taxes; he was supreme judge. He also governed the Church in his dominions: he nominated the bishops; he convoked synods, participated in their debates, and confirmed their canons; he interfered in theological disputes and did not shrink from defining dogmas and compelling his subjects to accept them; he was the defender of the Church and deemed it his duty to combat heresy and to spread the orthodox faith. He was considered "sacred": on the day of his accession he was solemnly anointed by the Patriarch of Constantinople; throughout his reign he was the center of dazzling ceremonies; in works of art his head was surrounded by the halo of the saints.

Frequent Revolutions. — In Byzantium, as in Rome, the office of Emperor was not strictly hereditary. In theory the choice of

Emperor still rested with the Senate, but the Senate was frequently compelled, by political or military groups, sometimes to give the office to a son or other relative of a late Emperor and sometimes to confer it upon a revolutionary leader. Now and then a regular succession would be maintained for a while in a particular family, but eventually it would die out or be overthrown by violence. Between 395 and 1453, out of 107 Byzantine Emperors only thirty-four died natural deaths in office; while eight perished in the course of war, or accidentally, all the others abdicated, or met with violent deaths, as the result of some sixty-five revolutions in the army or in the palace. Women played an important part in the intrigues and palace-revolutions.

The Officials. — Around the person of the Emperor revolved numerous dignitaries, who formed the court and composed the members of the central government. For local government, the Empire was divided into provinces (themes), each under a governor called a "strategus." Both the provincial governors and the central administration at Constantinople employed a large staff of under-officials and secretaries, constituting a bureaucracy which was well trained and well disciplined and generally of excellent quality. The permanence of the bureaucracy compensated, at least in part, for the revolutions in the palace and in the army.

Constantinople. — For centuries the most vital part of the Byzantine Empire was Asia Minor. This region had a hardy peasantry and was the principal source of food and soldiers. So long as it remained to the Empire, the Empire flourished. But if Asia Minor was the most substantial part, the city of Constantinople was the most showy. Constantinople, under the Byzantine Emperors, was the greatest city in Christendom, if not in the world. Here, numerous public buildings of classical architecture and private houses of a more modern type, palaces and churches, baths and hotels, underground cisterns and aqueducts, columns and statues, combined to produce an incomparable effect. A writer of the tenth century justly sang the praises of "the famous and venerable city which dominates the world, whose thousand marvels shine with singular brilliancy, with the splendor of her lofty

buildings, the glory of her magnificent churches, the arcades of her long porticoes, the height of her columns rising towards the sky."

Between the seventh and eleventh centuries the city housed a population of from 800,000 to 1,000,000. It was a vast population for that time, and a motley population. From every province of the Empire and from every country in the known world, men flocked to Constantinople for business and for pleasure. There were Jews in Asiatic dress, Bulgarians with shaved heads and curious clothes, fur-clad Russians with long fair mustaches, Armenian or Scandinavian adventurers, who had come to seek their fortunes in the great city, Moslem merchants from Bagdad or Syria, and Western merchants, Italians from Venice or Genoa, Spaniards, and Franks. And in the midst of this picturesque crowd, the leading natives of the city — the true Byzantine Greeks — might be recognized by the rich silken garments embroidered with gold in which they were clad, the fine horses on which they were mounted, and the exhibition of such luxury as gave them, as was said by a visitor, "the appearance of so many princes."

At Constantinople, where extravagance of dress vied with beauty of architecture, three things were specially characteristic: (1) the pomp of religious ceremonial, as displayed by the Church ritual on great feast days; (2) the brilliant ostentation of imperial life shown in the receptions and etiquette of the Sacred Palace; (3) the amusements of the Hippodrome. "For God," says a celebrated historian, "there was the grand church of Saint Sophia, for the Emperor the Sacred Palace, and for the people the Hippodrome." The people of Constantinople paid no taxes and many of them did no work. They were partially fed by the government, and in the Hippodrome they were provided with circuses, vaudeville shows, and chariot races. Games were patronized by the Emperor and his court and were organized by rival societies of the "Greens" and "Blues." Every native was a partisan of either the "Blues" or the "Greens," and for centuries these factions of the Hippodrome were a disturbing and riotous element in the life of the capital and the politics of the Empire.

Byzantine Culture. — The centuries from the sixth to the eleventh might be the Dark Age in western Europe, but not in the

Byzantine Empire. In Byzantium the traditions of classical Greek civilization and of Christian civilization remained firmly rooted and intertwined. Greek was the national language, and libraries were richly endowed with all the wealth of Greek literature, pagan

EXTERIOR OF SAINT SOPHIA AT CONSTANTINOPLE

Built by the Emperor Justinian in the seventh century as the Catholic cathedral of his capital, it has been from that day to this the finest architectural expression of Byzantine civilization and the greatest monument in the Near East.

and Christian, old and new. A great palace-school, or university, was established in the fifth century and reorganized in the ninth century; there was an important law school; medicine was the object of scientific research; and popular education was promoted. Art, too, was fostered and reached a high stage of development in the Byzantine Empire. A special type of architecture — the

so-called Byzantine — was evolved, beginning with the great masterpiece of Saint Sophia and expressing itself in a curious use of brick and in the multiplication of domes. And the decorative arts were notably featured: churches and palaces were resplendent with precious marbles, glittering mosaics, magnificent work in gold and silver, and wonderful hangings; there were sumptuous tissues shot with purple and gold, finely carved ivories, bronzes inlaid with silver, richly illuminated manuscripts, elaborate enamels, gold and silver plate, and costly jewels. It was a brilliant civilization, at once pagan and Christian.

The civilization of the Byzantine Empire was in closer relationship with the ancient Græco-Roman civilization, and at least materially and intellectually it was more advanced than civilization in Western Europe. The result was a self-satisfaction on the part of the citizens of the Byzantine Empire and a sense of their superiority over all other Christians. They took it for granted that Greek was *the* language of Christianity and that the Byzantine Greek Empire was *the* Christian Roman Empire. Under the circumstances it was but natural that Christianity in the Byzantine Empire should be largely nationalized and that Byzantine Emperors, accustomed to dominate the Greek Church in their state, should clash with the Popes of Rome and with the Latin Church.

Patriarch *vs.* Pope. — The chief official of the Catholic Church in the Byzantine Empire was the Patriarch of Constantinople, and between him and the Bishop (Pope) of Rome considerable rivalry developed in the eighth century. The Pope, as we have seen,[1] claimed to be the successor of Peter, the chief of the Apostles, and as such the chief bishop of the whole Church. The Patriarch, on the other hand, though his office dated only from the fourth century, enjoyed the powerful support of the Byzantine Emperor, and, like the Emperor, was inclined to resent any attempted interference of the Pope in Church affairs in the East.

As time went on, the rivalry between Patriarch and Pope was emphasized by the growing differences between eastern Europe and western Europe. Greek was the language of the Church

[1] Note, see pp. 426–427.

within the Byzantine Empire; Latin was the language of the Church among the Romans, Celts, and Germans of the West. The independence of the Pope from the Byzantine Empire gave him a commanding position in central and western Europe and enabled him to increase and extend his spiritual (and temporal) sway at the very time when in the East the Patriarch was becoming a mere official of the Empire. From the eighth to the eleventh century there was growing division in the Christian Church between East and West.

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

BYZANTINE SCULPTURE

A bronze plaque of the twelfth century, representing the Crucifixion. Much of the finest Byzantine art dealt with religious subjects.

The Iconoclasts. — At first, for over a hundred years, there was a bitter dispute about images. The Byzantine Emperor Leo III, supposing that Christians were worshipping images of Jesus and the saints and were thereby lapsing into paganism, and mindful perhaps of Moslem taunts against Christian "idolatry," ordered in 726 the destruction of all statues and pictures in Christian churches. Some of his subjects at once acted upon his orders and went about smashing statues (hence they were called "iconoclasts" — "image-breakers"). At the same time the Pope spoke out vigor-

ously in defense of statues and pictures; he condemned Leo III, and excommunicated the iconoclasts; that is, he declared that they were heretics and out of communion with the Catholic Church. It is not necessary to narrate all that happened in the protracted controversy over images. All the Popes took one side, and most of the Emperors and Patriarchs took the other side. Most Christians in the West were with the Pope; those in the East were divided. It was not until 842 that iconoclasm was finally condemned by the Byzantine court and people.

The Decree of Photius. — The failure of iconoclasm was undoubtedly a triumph for the Catholic Church and the Papacy and for the future of Christian art. But the long controversy had broken friendly relations between the Pope and the Byzantine Empire. A crisis soon occurred. The Emperor deposed a Patriarch of Constantinople and put a certain Photius (fō′shĭ-ŭs) in his place. The deposed Patriarch appealed to the Pope, and the Pope requested the Emperor to restore him. Thereupon, Photius, with the backing of the Emperor, issued a solemn decree (867), excommunicating the Pope, declaring the practices of the Roman Church to be contrary to Greek usage and therefore heretical, and insisting that the intervention of that Church in the affairs of the Byzantine Empire was unlawful. A schism (that is, a religious division) was thus created between East and West.

The Orthodox Church. — Under a new Emperor the schism was temporarily ended: Photius was disgraced and exiled, and more normal relations were resumed between the Pope and the Byzantine Empire. But not for long. The old rivalry and enmity soon reappeared and grew steadily. Finally, in the eleventh century, another Patriarch of Constantinople, with the support of the Emperor and the Greek people, completed what Photius had begun; he definitely broke with the Pope. Thus the Patriarchate of Constantinople repudiated the Papacy and the Christianity of the West and became an independent national Church. It prided itself so much on its orthodoxy that it was called — and is still called — the Orthodox Church.

Two Christian Churches in Europe. — After 1054 there were two separate Christian Churches in Europe: (1) the Orthodox Church

of the Byzantine Empire, Greek in language and tradition, patriotically attached to the Byzantine Emperor and the Patriarch of Constantinople; and (2) the Catholic Church, embracing the Holy Roman Empire and the several national states of Romance, German, and Celtic peoples, Latin in ecclesiastical language and tradition, loyally attached to the Pope. The Western Church was larger than the Eastern Church and more vigorous, and if the East prided itself upon its Orthodoxy, the West boasted of its Catholicity.[1]

Though the two bodies of Christians disliked and despised each other, they had much in common, they tolerated and constantly influenced each other, and on occasion they could and did unite for common purposes. For centuries Eastern Christians stood as a bulwark against Islam and Mongol heathenism, enabling the West to develop its own great forms of medieval Christian civilization.

Extension of Civilization among the Barbarians of Central and Northern Europe

Conversion of Germany. — At the very time when the Moslem Arabs were being driven away from Constantinople by Leo III (718) and from southern France by Charles Martel (732), civilization was being spread in central Europe by Christian missionaries. For some time previously, Celtic monks from Ireland and Scotland had travelled and preached in Germany on their way to and from Rome, and some bishops in Italy and France had interested themselves in the lands and peoples beyond the Alps and the Rhine.

Boniface. — The outstanding missionary and organizer of Christianity in Germany was an Englishman, Winfred (as he was originally named) or Boniface (as he was later called), who was born about 680 and educated in monastic schools in his native land. Boniface's own nation had only recently been converted to Christianity, and with the zeal of the convert and the daring of youth

[1] Both the churches claimed to be Catholic *and* Orthodox. It is chiefly modern usage which calls the Church of the West "Catholic" and that of the East "Orthodox."

(and the ability of a statesman) he resolved that the knowledge of Christianity which Pope Gregory the Great had bestowed upon him and his fellow Anglo-Saxons he would impart to the other Germans on the Continent who were still heathen. He visited Rome and obtained from Pope Gregory II a commission to preach the Gospel in Germany. Then, for thirty years, in close coöperation with the Papacy and the Frankish state, he labored in Thuringia, Hesse, and Bavaria, with important and lasting results. He converted thousands. He established monasteries and schools, in which hundreds of other missionaries were trained. Named archbishop himself, he appointed bishops and priests, held synods, and introduced order into the newly founded and rapidly growing Church in Germany. He also encouraged art and learning, and his favorite monastery at Fulda became the center of Christian civilization in central Europe. Boniface in his late years undertook a mission in the Netherlands and there died a martyr's death in 754.

Charlemagne and Louis. — The work begun by Boniface was continued by the Carolingian Emperors. Charlemagne, in extending his Empire, was something of a crusader and ever the patron of Christian missions, in part because he believed sincerely in the truth of Christianity itself and in part because he thought that Christianity would civilize the Germans and make them better citizens: by force he obliged the Frisians and Saxons to accept Christianity. Louis the Pious, Charlemagne's successor, pursued the same policy, though in a more peaceful manner: he founded a Christian bishopric at Hamburg and encouraged Christian missions among the Danes. By the end of the ninth century, west-central Europe from the Rhine to the Baltic professed Christianity and was organized as a part of the Catholic Church.

Conversion of the Slavs. — Simultaneously, east-central Europe was undergoing conversion to Christianity. Here, among the Slavs, two brothers, Cyril and Methodius, did much the same sort of pioneer work in the ninth century which Boniface had done a hundred years earlier among the Germans. The brothers were natives of Salonica in the Byzantine Empire and were educated at Constantinople, Cyril becoming a priest, and Methodius, after practising law for a time, becoming a monk. They established

themselves in Moravia among the westernmost Slavs and proceeded to make numerous converts. To aid them in their work, they reduced the Slavic language to writing, using Greek letters (with certain adaptations and additions) for the purpose, and translated into Slavic the New Testament and parts of the Old and also the hymns and liturgy of the Greek Church. In 867 they visited Rome and secured the Pope's blessing on their work and his approval of the ordaining of Slavs to the priesthood and of the use of the Slavic language in Church services. The devoted brothers performed signal services. They converted the Slavs in the territory now known as Czechoslovakia (chĕk′ō-slō-vä′kĭ-ȧ) and trained and organized them. Moreover, by inventing an alphabet and teaching the Slav converts to read and write in their own language they laid the foundations for Slavic literature. In addition they inspired a host of disciples who subsequently carried the Gospel to all the other Slavs in Europe.

Poland. — From Czechoslovakia, Christianity spread to Poland. A Polish chieftain, Mesco (mĕs′cō) by name, was converted through the influence of his wife, a Czech (chĕk) princess, and many of his people were converted by Adalbert, the Czech Bishop of Prague, who had been sent into Poland by the Pope and who was later assassinated by pagan Poles. Boleslav (992–1058), the son of Mesco, was an ardent Christian. He erected at Gnesen a national shrine for the martyred Adalbert, and with the approval of the Pope appointed an archbishop and several bishops, and organized the Church in his country. Through his efforts Poland, like Czechoslovakia, became Christian.

Russia. — About the same time Christianity was propagated among the eastern Slavs — the ancestors of the modern Russians — by missionaries from Constantinople who were trained in the methods of Cyril and Methodius and were backed by the Byzantine Emperors. The daughter of the Emperor Basil II married the head of the chief Russian state, Prince Vladimir (vlăd′ĭ-mĭr, 980–1015) of Kiev; and Prince Vladimir, with his twelve sons, abandoned paganism and accepted Christianity. Through the combined efforts of Vladimir and the missionaries, the Russian nobles and people were gradually converted to Christianity.

Eastern and Western Slavs. — In the eleventh century the Slavs were Christians, but they were already becoming divided between the Catholic Church of the West and the Orthodox Church of the East. With the extension of the West Roman Empire eastward, the Poles and the Czechoslovaks fell more and more under the political, ecclesiastical, and cultural influence of the West. Latin supplanted Slavic as the ecclesiastical language in Poland, Bohemia, and Moravia; the churches of these countries remained Catholic, in communion with Rome; and central Europe thus threw in its lot with Western Europe.

An Early Russian Church

The Church of Saint Sophia, built at Novgorod in the eleventh century in the Byzantine style.

On the other hand, the political and commercial relations between Byzantium and Kiev were so intimate that the Russians — the most numerous of all the Slavs — followed the Byzantine Empire in religion. They rejected overtures from the Pope and set up a national Russian Church, under the honorary headship of the Patriarch of Constantinople, with Orthodox creed and practice, but with a distinctive Slavic liturgy. Henceforth they drew their civilization, as they had derived their Christianity, from Constantinople; they were cut off from the West; they belonged to the East.

The Yugoslavs (southern Slavs) were cleft asunder. Those within the Byzantine Empire, that is, south of the Danube, became Orthodox, wrote their language in Greek characters, and were Eastern; those nearer to Italy and Germany, that is, north of the

Danube and in Dalmatia, became Catholic, wrote their language with Latin letters, and were Western.

The Bulgarians with their King Boris (852–893) had been converted to Christianity in the ninth century. The Bulgarian Church was organized as a national Orthodox Church, under an archbishop of its own, in communion with Constantinople rather than with Rome.

Extension of Christian Civilization. — So from the eighth to the eleventh century Christianity made noteworthy progress in Europe. It expanded throughout central Europe, among Germans and Slavs, from the North Sea to the Dnieper River, from the Rhine and Danube to the Baltic, over a territory more extensive than the original European provinces of the Roman Empire in which it had triumphed from the first to the fourth century. It promised speedily to tame and civilize lands and peoples which hitherto had always been barbarous. It introduced more settled and refined ways of living, the arts of reading and writing, and more substantial political structures. The "civilized" world of Europe was no longer restricted to the Mediterranean coast; it now had centers not only in Rome and Constantinople but also in Iona, York, Fulda, Hamburg, Prague, Gnesen, and Kiev.

More Barbarians. — The civilizing influence of Christianity in central and northern Europe would have produced quicker and greater results had it not been offset by the demoralizing effect of new barbarian invasions. In fact, just as in the fifth and sixth centuries a wave of barbarian invasions all but engulfed pagan and Christian civilization in southern Europe, so in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries another wave of barbarian invasions imperiled and halted the development of Christian civilization in central Europe. In other words, Charlemagne's Empire was beginning to shed some light upon the darkness which the first invasions had brought, when the second invasions intensified the cultural gloom and prolonged the "Dark Age." These second barbarian invasions — from the ninth to the eleventh century — were of Scandinavians, Hungarians, and Moslem pirates. We must say a few words about each.

The Scandinavians. — Of the early Scandinavians we know very little. They were a German people, living close to the sea

in the northwestern peninsulas of Denmark and Scandinavia (Norway and Sweden). While their southern kinsfolk invaded the Roman Empire in the fifth century and came then and later under Roman influence they themselves remained behind in their primitive habitations and occupations, fierce and warlike, pagan and untutored. When they emerge in history they are called by a great variety of names — Northmen, Norsemen, Normans, Norwegians, Danes, Vikings, Varangians; one group were called "Rus." Why they emerged, we do not know; perhaps because of a sudden increase of population; perhaps because of especially destructive feuds among themselves. At any rate from the ninth to the eleventh century they issued forth in boats from the creeks, bays, and fjords with which their rugged coasts abound, and voyaged far and wide.[1] In their long, strong, swift boats, equipped with from fifteen to sixty pairs of oars, they fearlessly crossed the seas and not only assailed and pillaged the coasts of Europe but penetrated, plundering and slaughtering and burning, far inland up the great waterways. They laid waste large tracts of Ireland, Scotland, and

Courtesy of the sculptor and of A. B. Bogart, the photographer

THE VIKING

Photograph of the statue by Georg J. Lober.

[1] The old Norse word for "bay" or "fjord" is *vik*, and "Viking" (vī′kĭng) meant a person who haunted such an opening and used it as a base for raids on the surrounding country.

England; they wrought grave havoc and mortal injury to the Carolingian Empire; they entered the Mediterranean and sacked Christian towns in Spain and Italy and Moslem towns in North Africa.

Their Conquests. — Beginning as wild robbers, the Vikings gradually became conquerors and colonizers. They seized Dublin and established a Norse kingdom in Ireland (about 850). They settled in England and set up a Danish kingdom, which supplanted all the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms except Wessex, then ruled by Alfred the Great (871–900). They colonized northwestern France and created the duchy of Normandy (911). Far to the west of Scandinavia, they discovered and occupied Iceland (about 850). Simultaneously, to the eastward, a band of Swedes — the Rus — crossed the Baltic, conquered Slavic tribes in the neighborhood of Novgorod, established a state with its capital at Kiev, and gave their own name to the conquered East Slavs, who were henceforth known as Russians. From Kiev they assailed the Byzantine Empire and even besieged Constantinople (865). Again in 907 the Rus appeared before Byzantium, this time with 2000 ships, and forced the Greeks to pay a heavy ransom.

A Viking Ship
From a miniature of the tenth century.

Their Assimilation. — Next to the suddenness and the wide sweep and the frightfulness of their first expeditions, the most amazing thing about these Scandinavians was the rapidity and thoroughness with which they adopted the manners and customs of the people among whom they settled. Away from Scandinavia and in contact with a higher civilization, they quickly lost their distinctive character. In Ireland their political sway was ended

by an uprising of the native Celts and the ensuing battle of Clontarf (1014), but they had already become Christians and their descendants were soon completely merged with the earlier Irish stock. In England the Danes adopted the Christianity of the Anglo-Saxons and after giving a great king (Canute, 1015–1035) to the country, they fused with the natives and accepted the restoration of the English monarchy in the person of Edward "the Confessor" (1042–1066), a member of the royal house of

NORMAN KNIGHTS ENGAGED IN THE CONQUEST OF ENGLAND
From the Bayeux Tapestry.

Wessex and a descendant of Alfred the Great. The Normans in Normandy became French in language and Christian in religion; their Duke William (1035–1087), a subject of the King of France, a friend of the Pope, and a relative of Edward the Confessor, conquered England in 1066 and established Norman-English rule in that country. The Rus at Novgorod and Kiev became Slavic in language and eventually, under Prince Vladimir, Orthodox Christian in religion. Some of them served as mercenaries in the armies of the Byzantine Empire; these adopted the Greek language and the Orthodox faith. One band, under a certain Robert Guiscard (gēs′kär′), set up a Norman state in Sicily and

southern Italy (1059): these learned Italian and championed the Catholic faith.

Conversion of Scandinavia. — Meanwhile, Christian missionaries, not content with converting the Scandinavians who settled in Christian lands, carried the Gospel to Scandinavia. A monk, Ansgar, was the great apostle in Denmark, and his labors and those of the German archbishop of Hamburg led eventually, late in the tenth century, to the general acceptance of Catholic Christianity in Denmark. At about the same time Christianity, brought to Scandinavia by English monks, was professed by the Norwegian and Swedish kings and spread gradually among their people. Thus northwestern Europe in the eleventh century was converted to Christianity and opened to civilization.

Leif Ericsson in "Vinland." — It is a curious fact that a vastly larger area — a whole continent hitherto quite unknown to Europe — was almost opened up to Christian civilization at this time. For, a certain recent Viking convert, Leif Ericsson (lēf ĕr′ĭk-sŭn) by name, was commissioned by the first Christian king of Norway to carry the Catholic faith to Scandinavians who had lately gone on from Iceland to Greenland; and Leif, in making the long missionary voyage, was "tossed about" and came upon a strange country where he found "self-sown wheatfields and vines"; he called this country "Vinland"; it was probably the North American coast. Though colonized for a brief period by Catholic Norsemen under a relative of Leif, Vinland was abandoned and almost forgotten. Catholic bishops functioned throughout the Middle Age in Iceland and Greenland, but five centuries elapsed after the time of Leif until America was fully opened to European civilization.

The Magyars. — Contemporaneous with Scandinavian invasions of Christian Europe, a horde of heathen Asiatic nomads, similar to the earlier Hunnish horde of Attila,[1] and probably for much the same reason, left their native haunts east of the Caspian Sea, swept around north of the Black Sea, and descended upon Europe (about 900). These nomads were called Hungarians or Magyars (mŏd′-yŏrz), and they displayed all the courage and cunning and all the

[1] See p. 457.

savagery and destructiveness of their predecessors. They expelled the Slavs from the rich broad plains north of the Danube and gave their own name to the region (Hungary); and thence they struck out in all directions. They ravaged Czechoslovakia and Poland, Thuringia and Bavaria, Lotharingia and Burgundy. They raided the Byzantine Empire and in 942 were bought off under the very gates of Constantinople. The following year they raided Italy. The Saxon King of Germany, Otto I (later the first Holy Roman Emperor), proclaimed them the "enemies of God and humanity," refused to make terms, and finally beat them decisively in the battle of the Lechfeld (lĕk′fĕlt, in Bavaria, 955).

Hungary. — After the battle of the Lechfeld, the Magyars ceased to be nomads and settled down in Hungary. Christian captives whom they had taken in their earlier raids now taught them agriculture and gave them their first lessons in the Christian religion and civilization. In 985 their Khan (or King) Geza (gē′zȧ) received baptism, and ten years later he introduced Benedictine monks who converted his people. Under Geza's successor, Stephen (997–1038), the Magyars became orderly; the Pope conferred upon Stephen the title of King (1001); and Hungary, while preserving its distinctive Asiatic language and its political independence, became a cultural part of civilized Europe.

Moslem Pirates. — Europe also suffered, during the period of Scandinavian and Hungarian invasions, from continuing Moslem depredations. By the eighth century the Moslem Arab Empire extended, like a huge crescent, from Western Asia across northern Africa to Spain, and in the coast-towns of this Empire, Moslem pirates (Saracens they were called by the European Christians) fitted out ships which preyed upon Christian commerce in the Mediterranean and plundered the Christian ports opposite. In the ninth century they captured Crete and subdued Sicily and used these islands as bases for their raids and robberies. They long terrorized the Mediterranean coasts. They occupied cities in southern Italy; they sacked Salonica and the Ægean islands; in 846 they broke into the Church of St. Peter at Rome. It was only in the eleventh century, at a time when Scandinavians and Hungarians were being Christianized and civilized, that the



THE CAROLINGIAN, BYZANTINE, AND MOSLEM EMPIRES, ABOUT 800 A.D.

Byzantine Empire got the upper hand of the Moslem pirates in the eastern Mediterranean and that the Normans under Robert Guiscard expelled them from Italy and Sicily.

The Revolution in the Moslem Empire

An Unwieldy Empire. — The Moslem Arab Empire, founded by Mohammed and ruled by Caliphs, first from Medina and then from Damascus, was short-lived. It grew too fast; it was based too much on conquest; it was too large; it was composed of too many diverse elements. Its original unifying forces were a common religion (Islam) and a conquering and expanding nation (the Arabs). But after the first enthusiasm of the new religion and the wide conquest was spent, difficulties multiplied. It was comparatively easy to build the Empire; it was extremely hard to maintain it.

The Arabs, devoted to their several families and tribes more than to their nation and Empire, soon resumed the family and tribal feuds which had characterized them before the advent of Mohammed. Thinly spread as they now were over a vast territory, their internal feuds easily enabled the more numerous subject peoples to reassert themselves. Only in Syria and Mesopotamia were the Arabs a large fraction of the population; in Africa they were but a veneer on the surface of Egyptians, Berbers, and Moors; in Spain they were but a handful among Moors, Berbers, and Romance Spaniards; in Persia they were only a governing class among the mass of native Persians. The Persians, particularly, though they had accepted Islam, had never taken kindly to Arab rule.

The Caliphate of Bagdad. — In 750 a revolution occurred in the Arab Empire. A family who were descended from Abbas, an uncle of Mohammed, gained the assistance of rebellious tribes, overthrew the Omayyad Caliphate,[1] and established the Abbasid Caliphate. The capital was removed from Damascus to the newly founded city of Bagdad on the Tigris. Persia supplanted Syria as the center of the Empire, and the person of the Caliph

[1] See p. 476.

was surrounded with oriental pomp and ceremony. The revolution of 750 amounted to a Persian triumph over the Arabs.

Harun al-Rashid. — One of the most celebrated of the Abbasid Caliphs was Harun al-Rashid (hä-rōōn′-är-rȧ-shēd′, 786–809), a contemporary of Charlemagne. Under Harun, Bagdad became the metropolis and commercial center of the Moslem world. It vied with Constantinople in size and beauty and wealth and was the meeting place of silk-merchants from China, fur-traders from Russia, and business men from Egypt and Spain. Harun himself was a scholar and poet, and was well versed in history. He gathered round him a great number of learned men, poets, lawyers, grammarians, mathematicians, and astronomers, to say nothing of the jesters and musicians who enjoyed his patronage. At the same time he was extremely strict in his religious observances; he prostrated himself in prayer a hundred times daily, and nine or ten times he made the holy pilgrimage to Mecca. Harun's fame spread throughout Europe, and Charlemagne and he exchanged gifts and compliments as masters respectively of the West and the East. To us nowadays Harun is best known as the hero of many of the stories in the "Arabian Nights"; and in Arabic literature he is the central figure of numberless anecdotes and humorous stories.

The Empire Shattered. — The revolution of 750 not only made Persia the center of the Moslem Empire and inaugurated the glory of Bagdad and the fame of Harun's court, but it led also to the disruption of the Empire. An Omayyad prince who escaped the general slaughter of his family at the time of the revolution, fled from Damascus, made his way across Africa, and, taking advantage of quarrels among Moors, Berbers, and Arabs, established his family as independent rulers of Spain. Africa, too, was soon lost to the Caliphate of Bagdad. Independent native states were set up in Morocco (788) and Tunis (800). In Egypt local Arab chieftains, while paying lip-service to the Abbasids, established practically independent dynasties. In 909 a family which claimed descent from Fatima, the daughter of Mohammed and wife of Ali, proclaimed themselves Caliphs, conquered Tunis, and extended their rule over all North Africa (except Morocco). In 969 they sub-

dued Egypt, founded Cairo, and made it their seat of government; in 991 they wrested Syria from the Caliphs of Bagdad. In the meantime the Omayyad ruler of Spain, Abd-ar-Rahman III (äb′dēr-rä′män, 912–961), proclaimed himself the Caliph of Cordova (929).

Thus, by the end of the tenth century, there were three rival Caliphates: (1) that of the Abbasids at Bagdad; (2) that of the



MOSQUE OF HASSAN AT CAIRO

The Moslem temple, built in 1356, is one of the largest structures in Cairo.

Fatimids at Cairo; and (3) that of the Omayyads at Cordova. But this was not all. Each of the three Caliphates rapidly declined; local princes and chieftains established a group of practically independent dynasties and states; and new foreign invaders, notably Turkish and Mongol nomads, set up rival tribal kingdoms in Persia and Syria. The line of Abbasid Caliphs outlasted the others, surviving at Bagdad until 1258 and thenceforth in Egypt until 1517, but their authority was strictly confined to spiritual

matters. The vast political Empire of the Moslems was broken in the eighth century, and by the eleventh century it was smashed into bits.

Moslem Culture. — Yet, despite the triumph of localism in the political world of Islam, the culture of particular Moslem regions



MOSELM DECORATION
The Hall of Ambassadors in the Alcazar at Seville, Spain.

immediately influenced the whole Moslem world. Islam proved to be, like Christianity, not so much the creator and preserver of a world-empire as a common and constant carrier of culture. We have already spoken of the high stage of Moslem civilization attained by Bagdad in the time of Harun al-Rashid: it was Moslem

in form and appearance, but its roots were in the older civilizations of the Persians and the Greeks. At a time when Alcuin and his few associates were introducing a little learning in the court of Charlemagne, a multitude of Greek and Persian and Arab scholars at the court of Harun were studying Aristotle and absorbing the wisdom of many another great ancient writer and transmitting their knowledge to Moslem schools in Damascus, Mecca, and Cordova. It was the same with many of the arts and sciences. The manufacture of writing-paper, the use of the compass, the employment of simple (Arabic) numerals (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 0) instead of the clumsy Roman device of indicating numbers by letters (I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X), the use of higher mathematics, especially algebra, the use of counting machines and other improved methods for the transaction of business, as well as the manufacture of exquisite cutlery, rugs, and silken fabrics — all these things were known at Bagdad before they were known in Europe; they were first transmitted through the Moslem world, and then to Europe.

Moorish Spain. — The chief point of contact between the Moslem world and Western Europe was Spain.[1] Here, under Abd-ar-Rahman III, Cordova vied with Bagdad in prosperity, art, and learning; and Moslem Spain, as a whole, became one of the wealthiest and most thickly populated countries in Europe.

The Moslems improved Spanish agriculture; they introduced the cultivation of rice, cane sugar, and other oriental products; they built great irrigation-works. They also promoted industry and trade: they mined gold and silver and other metals; they did much weaving of woollen and silken cloth — in Cordova alone there were 13,000 weavers; they introduced the manufacture of glass and writing-paper and leather goods and made Toledo famous for its swords and armor. They organized a regular postal service, and made Seville one of the greatest trade centers in western Europe: exports of figs, wine, and sugar went to Africa, Egypt, and Constantinople, and thence were forwarded to India and central Asia; the port of Seville was filled with vessels laden with Egyptian cloth, slaves, and singing girls from every part of Europe and Asia.

[1] Another important point of contact was Sicily and southern Italy.

Although education was purely a private matter, yet it was so widely diffused that most Spaniards, under Moslem rule, knew how to read and write, a standard which was still unknown to Western Christendom.

Under Abd-ar-Rahman III, Cordova was the greatest intellectual center in the West: thither flocked learned professors,

MOSLEM ARCHITECTURE
Part of the palace of the Alhambra at Granada, Spain.

students from every country, skilled copyists, rich dealers, and booksellers. It was also a great art-center. A peculiarly graceful and charming type of architecture appeared in Moslem mosques, palaces, and houses; and though for religious reasons painting and sculpture were not particularly encouraged, the decorative arts were carried to a perfection then equalled only in Constantinople.

Influence on Europe. — With this Moslem civilization of Spain, Western Europe was in fairly close touch. The Spanish

Christians influenced their Moslem neighbors somewhat, and the Moslems in Spain influenced their Christian neighbors more. There were spells of religious intolerance and outbreaks of fanaticism; wars were waged now and then between the independent Christian states in northwestern Spain and the Caliph of Cordova. But between Christians and Moslems visits were often exchanged and mutual assistance frequently given; they traded together and sometimes intermarried. Gradually, too, Christians came from France, Italy, or Germany to study in Cordova; and, as we shall see later, the Christian civilization of the Middle Age in western Europe owed an important debt to the heritage which, through trade, war, and study, it acquired from Moslem Spain.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Indicate on the map the territories lost and those gained by Christianity from the fourth to the eighth century.
2. What is meant by the "Dark Age"? Describe the condition of education, literature, and science in Western Europe during the Dark Age.
3. Who was the most famous Merovingian King? Why did the Merovingian monarchy come to an end? Mention two famous Mayors of the Palace who served under Merovingian Kings.
4. Who was the founder of the Carolingian Dynasty? Who was the most notable Carolingian King? Trace on the map the extent of the Carolingian monarchy at its height.
5. Describe the institutions of government in the monarchy of Charlemagne. What were the functions of the margraves and of the "*missi dominici*"? What were the capitularies?
6. In what ways did Charlemagne promote a revival of education and of learning?
7. Explain how the Carolingian Empire fell apart and disappeared.
8. Contrast the Byzantine with the Carolingian Empire as regards extent, continuation of Roman traditions, civilization, government, and power.
9. How and why did the Orthodox Church separate from Western Christianity?
10. Indicate on the map the territories conquered and the lands discovered by the Scandinavians.
11. Account for the break-up of the Arab Empire in the eighth century.
12. Describe the Moslem culture of Bagdad and of Spain, and indicate its influence on European civilization.

SPECIAL TOPICS

Constantinople about 1000 A.D. DAVIS, *Short History of the Near East*, 59–73.

The Saracen Empire and culture. DAVIS, *Short History of the Near East*, 144–157; BURY, *Later Roman Empire*, II, 258–273; MUNRO, *Middle Ages*, 214–226; CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY, II, ch. xii.

Charlemagne. ROBINSON, *Readings*, I, 126–146, or OGG, *Source Book of Medieval History*, 108–148; THORNDIKE, *Medieval Europe*, 199–213; EINHARD, *Charlemagne;* CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY, II, chs. xix, xxi.

Society in the eighth century. BURY, *Later Roman Empire*, II, 518–534; DILL, *Roman Society in Gaul*, 235–267.

Clovis. GIBBON, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. xxxviii; DILL, *Roman Society in Gaul*, 77–105; CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY, II, 109–116.

Byzantine commerce. BAYNES, *Byzantine Empire*, ch. xiii.

The Northmen or Scandinavians. THORNDIKE, *Medieval Europe*, 216–226; HASKINS, *The Normans in European History*, ch. ii; CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY, III, ch. xiii.

Norman conquest of England. MUNRO, *Middle Ages*, 204–213; HASKINS, *The Normans*, ch. iii; CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY, V, ch. xv.

Norman life and culture. HASKINS, *The Normans*, ch. vi.

Transmission of classical civilization to the Dark Age. TAYLOR, *Classical Heritage*, 44–70.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THE TEACHER

CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY, II, III, IV. C. W. C. OMAN, *Story of the Byzantine Empire*. C. DIEHL, *History of the Byzantine Empire*. N. H. BAYNES, *The Byzantine Empire*. W. F. ADENY, *Greek and Eastern Churches*. E. A. FREEMAN, *Byzantine Empire*. J. B. BURY, *History of the Eastern Roman Empire*. H. W. C. DAVIS, *Charlemagne*. G. B. ADAMS, *Civilization during the Middle Ages*. E. EMERTON, *Introduction to the Study of the Middle Ages*. O. J. THATCHER and E. H. MCNEAL, *Europe in the Middle Age*. S. DILL, *Roman Society in Gaul in the Merovingian Age*. A. MAWER, *The Vikings*. K. GJERSET, *History of the Norwegian People*, I. T. W. ARNOLD, *The Caliphate*. Other books on medieval history as in Chapter XIV.

CONVENIENT SOURCE MATERIALS

J. H. ROBINSON, *Readings*, I. EINHARD (or Eginhard), *Life of Charlemagne*. F. DUNCALF AND A. C. KREY, *Parallel Source Problems in Medieval History*. E. W. LANE (trans.), *Thousand and One Nights*. GUY LE STRANGE, *Baghdad during the Abbasid Caliphate, from Contemporary Arabic and Persian Sources*.

Payment of Taxes in a Medieval Town

The picture is from a medieval manuscript "Book of Accounts," now in the Library of Rouen (France). It shows town officials engaged in collecting taxes from well-to-do citizens (members probably of the merchant gild or of craft gilds) and making a record of the payments.

PART VI

EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION IN THE MIDDLE AGE

Introduction

After a troublous epoch of five centuries during which barbarian invasions had almost extinguished civilization in Europe, the great migrations ceased, the continent settled down to a more orderly existence, and the gloom of the Dark Age was gradually dispelled in the dawn of a revived Christian civilization. Europe entered upon a new period of history, commonly termed the Middle Age.

The Middle Age, as we use the term, extended from the eleventh to the fourteenth century. It was an era during which Europe, particularly western Europe, emerged from barbarism and constructed a rich, many-sided civilization — "medieval" civilization. This new civilization was not wholly new: it owed much to ancient times, especially to the classical culture of the ancient Greeks and Romans, and to Christianity. But old and new were combined and modified in such a way as to make medieval European civilization quite different from any ancient or any Asiatic civilization.

Much happened in western and central Europe between the eleventh and fourteenth centuries. We cannot tell it all, and to narrate any part of it in strict chronological sequence would be dull and uninforming. There would be so many trees that we could not see the woods. What we propose to do is to describe the principal features of western Europe during the Middle Age — its society (how the people lived), its government (how the people ruled and were ruled), and finally certain outstanding marks of its culture. We shall begin with medieval society and with one very significant factor in it — feudalism.

CHAPTER XVI

SOCIETY IN THE MIDDLE AGE

Feudalism

Origins of Feudalism. — Feudalism, the basis of European society during the Middle Age, had its origin in the preceding Dark Age. At that time neither the Roman Empire nor the German kingdoms had been able to afford continuously the needful protection against barbarian invasions and wars. Therefore, it became usual for the weaker and poorer farmers to apply for private protection to the stronger and wealthier. Freemen and small landowners made mutual-insurance agreements or contracts with powerful noblemen and great landowners, whereby the latter, in return for special personal services, promised to accord protection and support to the former. Precedents for such contracts already existed in the old Roman relationship of patron and client[1] (the Roman "patronage") and in the German custom (called "comitatus") of young braves' attaching themselves as loyal personal followers to some older warrior of famed prowess. Consequently, during the Dark Age, in a country like France, both the original Gallo-Roman farmers and the German immigrants found it natural and easy to enter into mutual-assistance contracts. Besides, it had long been a custom in the Roman Empire for a small farmer to seek protection from grasping tax-collectors and marauding bands by surrendering the ownership of his farm to a powerful and influential neighbor and then becoming a leaser or renter of the surrendered farm (henceforth called a "benefice"). From the Romans the Germans took over the principle of private property in land and the practice of the "benefice," and thus the personal contract became also, under feudalism, a contract about the ownership and use of land.

[1] See pp. 252, 364–365.

Feudal Contracts. — In time, the states and kings and emperors of western Europe — even cities and the Church — were drawn into feudal contracts. It became the vogue not only for small landowners and poor freemen to commend themselves to a great nobleman, but also for bishops and abbots and for towns likewise to enter into contracts with him, whereby they "served" him and he "protected" them. And as a great nobleman increased the number of his "benefices" and the number of persons who "served" him, he obliged his king or emperor to make a contract with him, just as if he were the equal of the king or emperor. The nobleman agreed to furnish troops to the sovereign; the sovereign agreed to leave the nobleman in undisturbed possession of his estates and rights and privileges.

Not a System. — Feudalism, originating in the Dark Age, flourished in the Middle Age throughout western Europe. Though universal, it was not a "system." The contracts upon which it was based were perpetually changing; there were infinite variations of detail from one country to another, from one estate to another, from one man to another. But generally, everywhere, the following practices were common to feudal society: —

Homage and Investiture. — The parties to a feudal contract were called "suzerain" (or "lord") and "vassal" (or "liege"), and the acts constituting the contract were called "homage" and "investiture." The vassal had to appear in person before the suzerain surrounded by his court, kneel before him, and put his own folded hands into the hand of the suzerain, saying: "I swear to be faithful and attached to you as a man should be to his lord." This was "homage." "Investiture" was the corresponding act of the suzerain, who delivered to his vassal a flag, a staff, a charter, or some other symbol of the property granted and the protection promised. In the case of poor people, the suzerain usually designated an agent to receive their homage and to confer investiture upon them.

Great nobles and some great churchmen did homage to the king or emperor and received investiture from him; in these cases the king or emperor was suzerain and the nobles and churchmen were vassals. Lesser nobles and many clergymen paid homage to the

great nobles and to powerful bishops and abbots and obtained investiture from them; in these instances the great nobles, bishops, and abbots were suzerains and the lesser nobles and clergymen were vassals. Every noble or churchman was suzerain to poorer people who owed him homage.

Fiefs.—The land held by a vassal from a suzerain was called at first a "benefice," but when a benefice became hereditary, that is, when it was handed down from father to child, as was usual in the Middle Age, it was called a "fief." Fiefs varied much in size, and large fiefs were ordinarily divided into sub-fiefs, that is to say, they were "sub-infeudated." The Holy Roman Empire and the several independent kingdoms were divided into very large fiefs, whose masters, the great nobles and landlords, were styled dukes or counts or earls or margraves and were vassals of emperor or king. Such very large fiefs were divided in turn into sub-fiefs of widely varying size, held by lesser noblemen (barons), country "gentlemen," and churchmen; some of these sub-fiefs were as large as counties, others had the area of a township, still others were as small as a hamlet; some of them might be sub-infeudated again into miniature fiefs. But the vassal on a miniature fief might become, by good luck in war or marriage, a suzerain of many large and wealthy fiefs.

Mutual Obligations. — A feudal contract between vassal and suzerain always involved duties for both. The suzerain was bound to render justice to his vassals and to protect them to the utmost of his ability, and if a vassal thought that he was not treated properly he might end the contract and leave his fief, or appeal to the king, though such action on the part of a vassal often led to private war between him and his suzerain. On the other hand, under a feudal contract, a general obligation of fealty (faithful obedience) was owed the suzerain by all vassals without distinction of rank, and special obligations of military, personal, or agricultural service were owed him by various classes of vassals.

The lowest class of vassals — agricultural laborers and small tenant-farmers — had to grant their suzerain a certain percentage of their crops, and some of them had to work a certain number of days every week or month on the personal private domain of their

suzerain, in order to provide him and his family and retainers with food and a living.[1] Other vassals were obliged to perform personal services for their suzerain. Some were overseers and officials of the whole estate, — financial, military, or judicial agents. Some were foresters, falconers, millers, etc. Some, who had no fiefs in land, were domestic servants, cooks, waiters, barbers, and entertainers. But the most important vassals, from the standpoint of feudal society, were the knights — persons who owed military service to their suzerain.

Medieval Knight in Armor

Duties of Knights. — As a rule, the central duty of a vassal, particularly of a knight, came to be his military service, which he was expected to perform at his own expense for about forty days every year and which he might be allowed to commute by making a payment (called "scutage") and thus enabling the suzerain to provide a substitute soldier. Besides, it was the duty of the vassal to attend the court of the suzerain, to aid him in giving judgment and in administering the estate. In certain exceptional circumstances the vassal was obligated to pay special sums of money, known as "aids": when the suzerain was taken prisoner and had to be ransomed; when the suzerain's eldest daughter was married, and a dowry had to be provided for her; when the suzerain's eldest son was knighted; and later when the suzerain went to the Crusades. If a vassal failed in one or another of his obligations, he was deemed a traitor and might be deprived of his fief. Otherwise, as long as he was faithful, he had to be supported in his fief and defended against every enemy.

Inheritance. — On the death of a suzerain, or of a vassal, the estate or fief, with its accompanying privileges and obligations, passed to the legal heirs. Rules of succession varied. In one place,

[1] A more detailed account of the relation of agriculture to feudal society is given in the next section of the present chapter. See p. 533.

male heirs alone could inherit lands; in another, women were permitted to share in the inheritance, although incapable of bearing arms. For a long time estates and fiefs were divided among brothers (and sisters), but it was usual to bestow the principal part of a large fief, including the chief town, upon the eldest son. Gradually an exclusive right of the eldest son to inherit the whole estate or fief (the right of "primogeniture") was widely recognized and became the foundation of an hereditary landowning nobility — a real caste — which was even prouder of its blood than of its battles. But this was later. Nobility in the earlier part of the Middle Age was still a nobility of personal courage and leadership more than of family prestige.

Position of Towns. — Feudal ideas and practices permeated all medieval life. Towns, as well as farms, were drawn into feudal relationships. Most towns were fiefs of king or nobleman or churchman, and were compelled to furnish soldiers and money to their suzerain in return for the protection he gave them. On the other hand, a town might be suzerain to vassal farms and villages.

Feudalism in the Church. — The Church, also, was largely feudalized. Bishops and abbots became both vassals and suzerains. We hear of one abbot, for example, who at the beginning of the Middle Age was a vassal of the King of France and already a powerful suzerain; his monastery owned nearly a hundred thousand acres of land, on which were living about three thousand families.[1] Many bishops resembled great nobles in the extent and nature of their feudal holdings and feudal power; although they were forbidden by the Church to bear arms themselves, feudal military service was customarily performed for them by their vassals.

Exceptions. — Some persons and parts of Western Europe remained outside of feudal relationships. A few cities in Italy and elsewhere managed to maintain their independence. And in regions where Roman law was still revered and respected, the old Roman notion of private property under an absolute owner helped to preserve a class of independent farmers (the so-called "allodial"

[1] This was the monastery of St. Germain des Prés, in Paris.

farmers) who owned the land in much the same way as modern farmers in the United States. There was a constant tendency, however, during the Dark Age and the earlier p t of the Middle Age, for allodial land (that is, land of independent farmers) to become feudalized. Feudalism was the dominant and normal basis of society throughout Western Europe.

Value of Feudalism. — Feudalism was needful and useful. At a time when individuals were surrounded by all manner of danger and disorder, when public state-governments were weak and powerless to maintain law and order and to cope with foreign invaders and domestic brigands, when ambitious chieftains and unscrupulous officials threatened to establish tyrannies and enslave their victims, feudalism appeared. Feudalism was primarily a vast mutual-insurance society. It lessened the danger of new barbarian invasions and the disorder resulting from former barbarian invasions. It set bounds to the ambitions of kings and tyrants. Being based on contract and on the recognition of mutual rights and duties, feudalism not only prevented the rise of slavery but also did much to get rid of the last relics of slavery in Europe, to assert the dignity and worth of every human being within the orbit of its influence, and to point the way to our modern ideas of individual liberty and representative government.

Disadvantages. — At the same time, feudalism had other and less pleasant consequences.

(1) It divided countries into a hodge-podge of duchies and counties and other estates whose feudal lords exercised sovereign powers, and thereby it hindered weak states from becoming strong and unified. It emphasized a region or a locality instead of a nation. National patriotism, such as we have nowadays, could hardly exist in the feudal society of the Middle Age. The ordinary individual might be loyal to a Duke of Normandy or to a Count of Paris; he would scarcely know what it meant to be loyal to France as a whole.

(2) Then, too, feudalism exalted aristocracy, which, if immediately useful in curbing kings and protecting the common people, was to prove in the long run an obstacle to democracy and a menace to public peace.

(3) Moreover, as we shall see later, feudalism brought on a terrific struggle between Church and State in every country throughout western Europe.[1]

Private War. — (4) But the worst feature of feudalism was private war. In theory feudalism existed to ensure peace, and actually it did serve to ward off new barbarians and to diminish the number and scale of wars among large states and populous nations. Nevertheless, it afforded many occasions and excuses for fighting. An ambitious suzerain might wish to enlarge his estate. An energetic vassal might desire to secure a bigger fief. Disputes might arise between suzerain and vassal over their contract or between one vassal and another. A town might hope to free itself from its overlord. An overlord might aspire to round out his possessions by forcing a town to do him homage. These matters would sometimes be adjusted peacefully in the feudal courts, but more often they were settled by feudal warfare. A feudal lord, with the assistance of such vassals as obeyed his summons, would wage a little war against some other feudal lord. The number of men in the contending armies in any one such war might not be large, and the slaughter and destruction might not be great. But little private wars were going on in one place or another all over Europe during the Middle Age, and the sum-total of their destructiveness was considerable. Private feudal warfare was a grave obstacle to commerce and interfered most seriously with the peaceful pursuit of agriculture and industry.

The Church and War. — The Christian Church, mindful of its mission of peace, endeavored to restrain feudal warfare. A series of synods, held in France during the eleventh century, decreed: "That henceforth no man should break into a church, that no one should molest or injure monks and their companions, that no one should dare to take a peasant or peasant-woman or to steal or kill domestic animals, that no one should attack merchants or pillage their wares." Those who might break this "Peace of God" would be excommunicated. Other synods went further

[1] The relation of feudalism to government in the Middle Age and likewise to the conflict between Church and State is discussed in the next chapter. See pp. 562, 567–568.

and decreed that during certain days of the week, from Wednesday evening to Monday morning, during certain feast days, and

Medieval Knights in Battle Array
From an old wood-cut.

during the seasons of Advent and Lent, there should be complete cessation of private wars. This was the "Truce of God." The feudal lords, however, were too used to fighting to abandon it simply because some unwarlike clergymen told them they should.

It was left for the kings in the later part of the Middle Age, with the moral backing of the Church, to halt and finally to end feudal warfare.

Chivalry. — In the meantime, the civilizing and refining influence of the Church was shown in the rise and vogue of chivalry. Any youth or man, even an agricultural laborer, might aspire to the knighthood of chivalry, but usually the title was given only to nobles. The candidate must be a Christian, brave, true to his promise, faithful to the Church and his lord, and zealous in defense of the weak, especially of women and orphans. The age at which one might become a knight was at first fifteen and later twenty-one. Knighthood might be conferred on the field of battle, but more often it was given during one of the great Church festivals, such as Christmas or Easter. Any knight might bestow knighthood on another, but in time the ceremony came to be associated with the Church. The candidate would go to the priest to have his sword blessed and would pass the night preceding the ceremony in prayer and vigil in the church; then, next day, the priest would receive the oath of the candidate at the altar, buckle on his sword, and administer to him a blow with the palm of the hand (the so-called "accolade"), adding the words "Be a valiant Knight!"

"Be a valiant Knight!" The teachings of chivalry were summed up in these words. They meant, above all, that the knight should be honorable in all his dealings. Christianity gave to feudalism the concept of honor, and honor was the soul of chivalry.

Tournaments and Battles. — Feudal lords and knights were trained primarily to the use of arms. As boys they played marbles, shuttlecock, and chess, and learned from clergymen how to read and write, but as they grew up their favorite sports were fencing and riding and hunting and tournaments. Tournaments were sham battles, fought without intent to kill and usually in the presence of ladies and a great crowd.

The real battles in which lords and knights indulged were nothing more than tournaments on a large scale and with deadly purpose. The combatants wore iron helmets and coats of mail and carried shields. They defied one another with loud shouts and fought hand to hand with short broadswords and wooden lances tipped

with iron. Every lord had a coat of arms and a banner or flag which accompanied him in battle.

Agriculture and the Countryside

Importance of Agriculture. — The vast majority of the people in the Middle Age lived not in cities but in the country, and supported themselves by work on the soil; they were farmers. The wealth and power of a feudal lord depended primarily upon the size and value of the farm which he dominated and from which he derived his sustenance and support. The social standing of most persons was determined by agriculture.

The Manor. — The farms of the Middle Age were quite different from the farms with which we are likely to be familiar nowadays. They were owned differently and they were worked differently. The most common farm of the Middle Age was not a piece of ground owned by one man and worked the year round by him and a few hired helpers. Rather, it was a large estate (or "manor," as they called it in England), owned and worked jointly by a considerable number of families. Few medieval farmers were absolute owners of land; the bulk of them, including even the nobles, were shareholders in an estate, a manor. Agriculture was a "shareholding arrangement."

An account of the English manor may serve to explain the nature of agriculture everywhere throughout western Europe in the Middle Age, for similar estates, under other names, existed in France, Germany, Italy, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and elsewhere. Manors varied in size, from a thousand acres to what we in the United States would call a township or even a county; but, large or small, they were all organized and conducted in much the same fashion.

Castle and Village. — The head of each manor was a "lord," and the members were "tenants." The lord might be a bishop or the abbot of a monastery, but more often he was a feudal nobleman — a duke, an earl, or a baron. In the latter cases, he had a manor-house, which was usually built on a hill or other commanding site and which was both dwelling and castle. The house itself — the donjon — was of wood or stone, with cellars, a great hall, a chapel,

and sleeping quarters for the lord's family, and with protecting towers. Around its adjacent courtyard were grouped storehouses and the houses of servants and workmen. And around these, in turn, were walls and a moat spanned by a drawbridge. The other members of a manor — the tenants — lived in cottages clustered close together in one or more villages, which ordinarily were not far from the fortified manor-house.



A Feudal Castle

The château of Arques, in France, as restored. It was built in the eleventh century.

Division of Land. — The lord had the exclusive use of certain specified lands, called the "lord's domain," and every householder had a garden of his own. All the other land of the manor was shared by lord and tenants jointly. Nearest to the village was *arable land*, divided into large fields, two or three in number. Each of these fields was divided again into "furlongs," and each of the furlongs was broken up into cultivated strips, each containing an acre and separated from the others by narrow banks (or "balks") of turf. Beyond the arable land were *meadows* for supplying hay; and still farther from the village — on the outskirts of the manor — were *woodlands* and *waste-lands*.

Every tenant had the exclusive use of a part of a strip in each of the large arable fields, and on this he raised grain for his family and his live stock. He might also appropriate the hay grown on a

particular strip of the meadow-land. Likewise he had the right to pasture a certain number of cows and sheep on the common pasturage and to take from the common woodland a certain amount of wood for building or for fuel. The amount of wood taken, the number of animals pastured, and the location and extent of the strips in the meadows and arable lands depended upon the social class to which the tenant belonged and upon the vote of the whole village or the decision of the manorial court. Sometimes the strips of arable land, and especially those in the meadows, were apportioned by the casting of lots.

The tenants comprised two more or less distinct classes: the free tenants, or "freeholders"; and the customary tenants, or "villeins."

Freeholders. — Freeholders were in the minority. They were the more well-to-do and independent tenants, who had personal contracts with the lord and who enjoyed the free use of a part of the lord's domain in return for fixed rents which they paid him. Though as members of the manor they were bound by the decisions of the whole village, they were personally quite free to remain on the manor or to leave it as they saw fit. They participated in the lord's court — the manorial court — and, unlike the villeins, they possessed the right to take their troubles to the king's court.

Villeins or Serfs. — The villeins were in the majority, and they were serfs. As serfs they were neither slaves nor freemen. They were not owned bodily by the lord. They could not be sold. They could not be deprived of their customary rights or of their right to a living on the manor. They could and did participate in the manorial court and in the making of agricultural rules and regulations for the whole manor.

On the other hand, they had no standing in the king's courts. They were not free to leave the manor without the lord's consent and could be reclaimed if they did. They were "attached to the soil." And they were burdened with special duties to the lord.

There were several varieties of villein, but as a rule every villein paid for his share of manor-lands in money, in kind, and in labor. In money, he paid a small fixed rent and certain dues. In kind,

he paid a small portion of honey, a few eggs, some chickens, and percentages of other produce. In labor, he paid more heavily. Roughly, half of the time in the year was left to him for work on his own account; the other half of his time and labor belonged to the lord.

A Villein

Week by week the villein had to come with his plough and oxen to plough the lord's domain; when ploughing was done he had to harrow, to reap the crops, to thresh and garner them, until his allotted number of days' labor in the year was done. Beyond this the lord might request of him extra days in harvest or other seasons of emergency, and such requests could not be denied. Further, all the cartage of the manor was performed by the villein, even to places as much as a hundred miles away. The mending of the ploughs, the planting of hedges, the digging of ditches, the shearing of sheep, and other miscellaneous work also fell upon him.

The Manor an Economic Unit. — The medieval manor was an economic unit. It was largely self-supporting and self-sufficing. All the foodstuffs and most of the clothing and other commodities used by lord and tenants were produced on the manor. Consequently each manor had a flour-mill, a bakery, a brewery or wine-press, and special shops, and on every manor, in addition to the agricultural laborers, there were a number of artisans, such as a blacksmith, a miller, a brewer, etc. These possessed cottages and gardens in the village and definite rights and duties. Besides, there were a number of officials: important ones, such as the bailiff, who represented the lord and superintended his affairs on the manor, and the provost or reeve, who represented the villeins and distributed their services; and minor ones, such as the shepherd, the swineherd, the beekeeper, the cowherd, the ploughman, etc. The bailiff lived at the manor-house and presided over the manorial

court; the lesser officials lived in cottages in the village. Moreover, every village had a church, and a parish-priest, who was usually the friend alike of lord and of tenants and the teacher as well as the preacher of the community.

—**Primitive Methods of Farming.** — Agricultural labor has never been easy, but it was far harder in the Middle Age than it is to-day. There was then no "scientific" farming, and few mechanical aids. Only such rude tools as the peoples of antiquity had known, were in use — the wooden plough (often without an iron point), the hand-scythe, the hand-flail, the sickle, and the hoe. Seed was scattered broadcast by hand; the lack of chemical fertilizers and ignorance about rotation of crops made it necessary to let

PEASANTS AT WORK

From a manuscript of the thirteenth century. Compare frontispiece.

one of the two or three great arable fields lie fallow every year; and the turning loose of all the animals of the manor together in the common pasture-land prevented any scientific breeding of live-stock. The result was not only hard hand-labor for the tenants but relatively small production. Farm-animals were small and crops were sparse. Only enough was normally produced to support the local inhabitants. Little could be exported and sold to outsiders. And when crops were short or when they failed, a scarcity or famine ensued which could seldom be relieved by purchases and imports from other manors. The ignorance and conservatism of the serfs — indeed, of all the agricultural classes — long prevented any improvement in these respects. And it should be remembered, too, that every manor was a part of feudal society and liable therefore at any time to be devastated by feudal war.

Peasant Life. — The life of the peasants — both freemen and serfs — was, on the whole, judged by modern standards, hard and monotonous and dismal. Few travelled away from the manor on which they were born, except to cart produce to some neighboring market or to attend their lord on some dangerous enterprise. They got up and went to bed with the sun and used candles on rare occasions. For fear of fires which might burn down their thatched villages, they had no stoves or fireplaces in their several cottages but depended upon a central fire and oven for their cooking and baking. Not only were their cottages without heat in winter, but during the whole year they were without running water and without adequate sanitation. What water was used was gotten from the village pump or spring, and laundering was done by the women at the brink of a river or creek. The diet was coarse and homely: brown bread, a few vegetables, ale or beer or wine, and occasionally some spiced or salted meat. Not many of the peasants could read or write, and most of them were superstitious. It was but natural, in the circumstances, that infant mortality was high and that epidemics and plagues, smallpox, typhoid, and cholera, swept a manor periodically and carried off a considerable number of its inhabitants. Despite a high birth-rate, the agricultural population of Europe did not perceptibly increase during the Middle Age.

Life in the Castle. — Even the lord and his family lived a life devoid of luxuries and comforts to which most of us are accustomed.

Games and Sports in the Middle Age

They had no electric lights or bathrooms or telephones or motor cars or radios; they did not have even kerosene lamps or sewing machines. The ladies sewed by hand — almost incessantly. The lord had few recreations and little incentive to read or study; and his castle, with its frowning battlements and its narrow grated windows and its perpetual readiness for siege, was more a fort and prison than a spacious, cheery home.

The Brighter Side. — Yet life on the medieval manor was not altogether dismal. From time to time there were great ceremonies and gala dinners and gay carrousels at the manor-house, to some of which the villagers were privileged to come. There were joyous festivities at Christmas and Easter, in which the whole manor participated. Occasionally a strolling musician or a clever peddler would visit the manor and provide diversion both for the villagers and for the residents of the donjon, and professional jesters were kept as permanent retainers by some lords to amuse them and their guests.

A Professional Jester

For the village, the Church was the maker and fashioner of social life, with its rites of christening (baptism), confirmation, marriage, and burial, with its Sunday services, with its holidays and feasts and fasts. At the parish church, more frequently than at the manorial court, the villagers of every degree met and associated together; and from time to time on the green in front of the church the villagers played and danced rustic dances.

With all its imperfections, rural life on a medieval manor was better and more uplifting than rural life on an estate of an ancient Roman or Egyptian. There was now little slavery. On the contrary, there was a general recognition that every individual had certain rights in person and property and that, though lord and villein belonged to distinct social classes, they both were Christians and as such

could meet each other in the relationship of man to man. The manor was an agricultural coöperative society, and every tenant, be he villein or freeman, was, like the lord, a shareholder in it and entitled to a voice in its management. The tenants had obligations to their lord, and the lord had obligations to his tenants. He was expected to assure them justice and protection and the exercise of their legal and customary rights. Underlying the medieval manor was some idea of agricultural democracy.

Industry, Trade, and the Towns

Old and New Towns. — The Dark Age had witnessed a sharp decline of town-population and town-prosperity. The Middle Age was noteworthy for the revival of town-life and town-activity. Old towns flourished again, and new towns came into existence. Some of the medieval cities, especially those of southern Europe, were survivals from ancient Roman times. Such, for example, were Rome, Naples, Genoa, Pisa, Florence, Marseilles, Lyons, Cologne, Mainz, London, York, and many another in Italy, France, Spain, southern Germany, and even England. Venice had been built by Italian fugitives, at the time of the Lombard invasion, on the small islands in the lagoons at the head of the Adriatic. Other medieval cities, particularly those in the Netherlands, central and northern Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, were newly founded, in the course of the Dark Age or early in the Middle Age, by kings and feudal lords, for a variety of reasons: sometimes to serve as a capital; sometimes to serve as a fortified frontier-post; sometimes to serve as the seat of a bishop and the center of Christian missionary enterprise in a recently conquered region; sometimes to serve as a market-place for the exchange of commodities between various lands and manors. Sometimes a manorial village, by reason of its convenient geographical location, would extend its commercial activity far beyond the boundaries of the manor of which it was the center and would grow into a real city.[1]

[1] There were almost as many words for "town" in the Middle Age as there were sources of its origin. "City" and "commune" were derived from Latin and referred at first to the surviving Roman towns. "Burg," "burgh,"

City Home-Rule. — Because the medieval cities were seats of bishops, and as such were governing centers of the Church, and because also their stout walls and armed citizens frequently warded off a barbarian expedition or a piratical raid and provided needful defense and assistance in feudal warfare, they were treated with considerable respect by the emperors, kings, and feudal lords of the time and retained or were granted special privileges. They developed a large measure of local self-government, of what we would term "home-rule," either under the leadership of their respective bishops or under the protection of neighboring noblemen, and they soon acquired a sense of independence and pride and a feeling of local patriotism.

Towns and Feudalism. — Most of the medieval towns were part and parcel of the prevailing feudal society. Some were fiefs of a bishop, some were fiefs of a king or emperor, some were fiefs of a duke or count or baron, who, in turn, might be the vassal of a king or bishop. Others were suzerains of the neighboring countryside, including manors and agricultural villages. A city might even be the suzerain of several other cities. Some were on the "domain-land" of a king or nobleman, and were considered by him, therefore, as his personal possessions. A few were quite outside of feudal relationships.

Charters. — Yet the feudal bonds which held most of the medieval cities were, as a rule, much weaker than those which bound the country at large. A city as a whole, rather than its individual citizens, entered into feudal relationships. Its citizens were not divided into freemen and serfs with varying obligations of a menial character to a lord, but all of them were recognized as freemen, as equal members of the city "corporation." Moreover, the contract between a feudal lord and a city was usually in the form of a written "charter" which narrowly defined the rights of the lord and broadly guaranteed the rights of the city corpora-

"borough," and "bourg" were different spellings of the German word for town and were applied to the newer foundations in Germany, England, and France. A "citizen" was the inhabitant of a city or the member of a commune; a "burgher" or "burgess" or "bourgeois" was the resident of a burg, a borough, or a bourg.



A Medieval City

Cambrai, as it appeared in the sixteenth century. From a contemporary engraving.

tion and its members. Thus the medieval cities managed their own affairs with a minimum of interference from any outside suzerain and came to represent better than the agricultural villages the spirit of local democracy. The internal democratic government of these cities had many conflicts with bishops and noblemen and kings, but, as we shall see later,[1] it eventually emerged triumphant in the practically free city-states of the later Middle Age.

Growth of Towns. — Towns grew during the Middle Age in size and importance. As centers of Church government and as part-time residences of noblemen and kings, they drew an ever increasing number of officials, agents, secretaries, and servants. As fortified havens of refuge from disorder or violence in the open country, they attracted numerous farmers, who, once experiencing the life of the city, had no desire to return to work on the soil. As places of freedom, they especially tempted the rural serfs, for a serf, if he could run away from his agricultural village and live for a year and a day in a town, would legally become a freeman and thenceforth could not be reclaimed by his lord. But most of all, it was as centers of manufacture and commerce that towns grew.

Revival of Trade. — Commerce, highly important in ancient Greek and Roman days, had languished during the Dark Age, but now in the Middle Age, with the Christianizing and civilizing of all Europe and with the ending of great barbarian invasions, it revived. Of course it was on no such scale as present-day commerce, but we could not have our marvellous modern commercial intercourse without its beginning in the revived commerce of medieval Europe.

Notwithstanding the fact that each medieval manor was, to a large extent, self-supporting and self-sufficing, a number of commodities had to be imported. Iron had to be obtained for tools and implements; spices and salt for preserving meat; saddles and bridles and carts for riding and driving; swords and armor for fighting. Besides, a well-to-do lord and his family, together with his more ambitious or frivolous retainers, were not content to wear the woollen clothing and heavy shoes which might be made on the manor; they wished to procure fine clothes and fashionable shoes, and likewise jewelry and all manner of adornment for

[1] See the next chapter, Chapter XVII, pp. 580–581.

themselves and their home, and these articles of luxury must be imported from afar. The parish-priest, too, needed or desired church-goods which usually had to be imported — service-books, pictures, statues, oil, wine, incense, etc. A manor in one part of Europe, say in France or Italy, might produce commodities such as oil and wine which were wanted but not produced by a manor in another part of Europe, say in England or northern Germany.



A Shop at Paris in the Thirteenth Century

Consequently every manor had to supplement its own agricultural production and its own handicraft by the importation of certain other agricultural products and of a considerable number of manufactured articles, and to pay for such imports it had to export some of its own products. In the needs of the manors lay the opportunity for merchants and the fundamental reason for the growth of towns.

Fairs, Markets, and Merchants. — The exchange of goods among the medieval manors, and between the manors and the towns, was undertaken most elaborately at a "fair" — a gathering of merchants, buyers, and sellers, in some appointed town, at specified intervals. But exchange of goods was constantly going on in the regular markets of the several towns. Around markets and fairs developed a professional class of merchants, that is, townsmen who acted as middlemen between sellers and buyers, and likewise between the

specialized manufacturers in the towns and the farmers — lords and tenants — in the neighboring countryside. Moreover, as towns grew in size and importance, the rôle of the town merchants was correspondingly enlarged. They had to arrange the purchase of larger food supplies and more raw materials from farmers and therefore had to sell more manufactured goods. They travelled farther. They even opened up and expanded distant trade with Asia. At the same time they became money-savers and money-lenders for noblemen, churchmen, and kings; they were the originators of modern banking.

Obstacles to Trade. — Commerce was handicapped in the Middle Age by lack of safe and easy means of communication and transportation. There were no railways, motor-trucks, telegraphs, or telephones. Postal service was rare and unreliable, and roads were not very good. Every feudal noble levied taxes on the transit of goods through his manor and collected tolls at bridges, fords, village, and castle. And when trade was not halted by feudal warfare, it was endangered by bands of thieves and brigands who beset the roads. It was natural, therefore, that the merchants of a town should form an association and seek to utilize the town's armed forces to safeguard their own interests.

The Merchant Gild. — The association of merchants in a medieval town was called a "merchant gild." In general, the merchant gild comprised the townsmen who were merchants, and its main function was to regulate the trade of the town and to protect its own members from the commercial competition of outsiders. It held periodic meetings at which the members banqueted, adopted by-laws, admitted new members, and elected officers. It frequently played an important part in the government of the town and in the conduct of foreign relations.

Craft Gilds. — As trade gave rise to the merchant gild, so manufacturing gave rise to another type of association in the medieval town — the "craft gild." A craft gild, sometimes styled a "mistery" or "company," usually comprised all the artisans in a single branch of industry in a particular town.

In every large town there were three groups of crafts and craft gilds: (1) those occupied with purely local business — butchers,

bakers, candle-makers, brewers, etc.; (2) those engaged in production for a distant as well as for the home market — the various textile crafts, the leather-workers, and the metal-workers; and (3) those concerned with wholesale merchandising, such as the drapers, who were wholesale dealers in woollens, and the mercers, who were wholesale dealers in silks, and the spicers (or grocers), who were dealers in spices, drugs, oil, etc.

From C. H. Herrick, "History of Commerce and Industry"

A Goldsmith's Shop in the Middle Age

The first group of crafts appeared almost everywhere and usually rose to positions of power and wealth. The second group, representing export industries, varied in different regions. Metal industries were most highly developed in Germany, Italy, and parts of Spain. The preparation of the finer grades of leather was originally a specialty of Moslem towns in Spain, but these tanning processes spread northward rapidly and gained a strong position in France. The woollen industry was the predominant export industry in northern France and the Netherlands and later in England. In the woollen industry — perhaps the most important

of all the industries of medieval Europe — specialization was carried to great lengths; the craft weavers of each town devoted themselves to a single type of cloth, or at most to a few types, and each different kind of cloth was thus designated by the name of the town in which it was made.

The third group of crafts, those concerned with wholesale business, were often closely associated with the general merchant gild of the town.

The member of any craft gild was a "master." He was both owner and workman, both capitalist and laborer. He bought raw material, manufactured it, and sold the finished product either from his own house, which served also as his factory and shop, or from his stall in the town-market or at a nearby fair. For distant sale, his goods might be bought and exported by the town's merchant gild, of which he was likely to be a member as well as being a member of his own craft gild. In his work he had no machinery; he did everything by hand — hence the word "manufacture," which means literally "to make by hand." In his manufacture, he had the casual assistance of his wife and daughters, and almost always the full-time aid of two classes of male helpers: (1) apprentices, young men or boys learning the trade, and (2) journeymen, young men who had completed several years of apprenticeship but for one reason or another had not yet become established masters.

In the ordinary course of things, craftsmanship was transmitted from father to son, but the craft gilds were not strictly hereditary, for a good deal of free choice of occupation was allowed, and the son of a candlemaker might be apprenticed to a shoemaker or a mercer and become in time a master and member of the craft of shoemakers or that of mercers. An apprentice was a sort of young serf to his master, being neither free nor slave; he had to work and in return was guaranteed protection and a living. A journeyman was more independent and usually received wages for his work; yet he could not think of becoming a master himself until he married and set up a household of his own and was then duly admitted as a member of the craft gild. Many journeymen became masters, but some remained journeymen all their lives.

THE TOWN HALL AT LOUVAIN (BELGIUM)

Built at the close of the Middle Age, in the fifteenth century, this is proof of the prosperity and artistic taste, as well as of the civic pride, of medieval townspeople.

No individual master could do as he pleased with his apprentices, or, for that matter, with his business. He was bound by the rules and regulations of the craft gild to which he belonged. Each craft gild not only possessed a monopoly in the town and sought to pre-

vent outside competition, but it determined the quantity and quality of goods manufactured by its members; it regulated the number and terms of service of apprentices; it endeavored to root out dishonest business practices. It held regular meetings and adopted rules and elected officers, chief among whom was usually a warden. It required all its members to contribute to its treasury, from which it provided special benefits for its needy members. It also observed certain religious and social usages. From time to time, in a body, with distinctive costume and banner, its members attended church or paraded the streets or participated in a town pageant.

The craft gild was at once a club, an employers' association, a trade union, an insurance society, and a semi-secret, semi-religious fraternal organization. In some cities the craft gilds vied with one another and with the merchant gild in dominating the local government.

Life in the Towns. — Medieval towns were inferior to most modern cities in the conveniences and comforts of life. The streets, in general, were narrow and crooked, noisy and ill-smelling, and darkened by the wooden houses whose upper stories jutted out from either side. The streets, if paved at all, were paved with cobblestones, and over the cobblestones horsemen, carters, and pedestrians jostled each other and made their way indiscriminately as best they could. The houses were three, four, or five stories high, dingy and insanitary, lighted in the daytime through small panes of glass and at night only by candles. Most of them were at once homes and shops and they housed apprentices and journeymen as well as masters and their families.

Some of the towns still utilized the old Roman reservoirs and aqueducts for their water-supply; others merely drew on a series of town wells and pumps, such as existed in the agricultural villages. The towns, like the villages of the time, were liable to be scourged with recurring epidemics and plagues, and also with fires.

Most medieval cities were walled and defended against outside enemies, but hired soldiers and stone walls were not always proof against attacks and plunderings by feudal and foreign armies or against domestic broils and internal thieves. Most medieval cities

were distracted by riotous conflicts between various craft gilds, by civil wars between rival factions, and by bloody feuds between families; and despite the custom of hanging lanterns in the windows of the houses to light the streets, and of requiring the citizens to take turns in serving as policemen, the numbers of footpads and robbers rendered it dangerous for a burgher to go out at night alone and unarmed.

But there is little doubt that city-life in the Middle Age was more attractive than country-life. There was greater opportunity for the individual to do as he pleased. There was a greater variety of food. There were certainly more interesting surroundings and more varied means of amusement.

Each medieval city had a magnificent cathedral with gorgeous furnishings and majestic ceremonies, and a large number of smaller but still very fine churches; and the churches were rivalled in architecture by the gild-halls of the merchant gild and the several craft gilds, by public buildings such as the town-hall (or Rathaus), and by palatial residences of noblemen, bishop, abbots, and very wealthy town-merchants. Around the cathedral was usually a green or park; and as a town grew and extended outside of its original walls, new walls and fortifications would be built at the extreme circumference and the site of the former walls would be utilized for broad avenues and playgrounds.

The town market was ordinarily a colorful, gossipy meeting-place in the daytime, and for night-life there were the Ratskeller and innumerable corner beer-shops. Parades and pageants and an occasional street-fair, sometimes under the auspices of the gilds and sometimes under the patronage of the Church, provided special diversion for all the citizens. Young journeymen with their sweethearts, as well as more staid masters with their families, and well-to-do merchants and noblemen with their ladies, had suppers and parties and balls at the inns or at houses.

Presently we shall see how certain medieval cities, particularly in Italy, Germany, and the Netherlands, by means of rapidly expanding trade, became very important both as political states and as cultural centers. In the meantime, however, before sketching the diverse governments in the Middle Age or the unifying

civilization which then flourished, let us try to set forth a few general facts about the whole society of medieval Europe — both its urban and its rural aspects.

Some General Remarks on Medieval Society

Coöperation. — Coöperation was the outstanding characteristic of social life in the Middle Age, but it was coöperation on a comparatively small scale. The smallest and most basic agency of coöperation was the family — father, mother, and children — who conducted a joint household. Father worked on the farm or in the shop; mother did the housework and made the clothing; the boys helped father, and the girls helped mother. Work of all sorts, in town as well as in country, centered in the home and proceeded from the household. A young man could not become a full-fledged master, or freeman, or villein, until he was a householder; and to be a householder he had to marry and have a home. The family was a contractual relationship; it was an economic unit; and it was a moral force of great strength.

The manor, as a larger unit of agricultural life and labor, was also coöperative. It represented joint ownership and joint action on the part of a group of families living close together in a village and working close together and in the same way on common arable lands, common meadows, and common woodlands. Corresponding to the manor in the country, were the merchant gild and craft gilds in the town. They too represented joint action on the part of a group of families living close together and working in the same way at the same jobs under common rules and regulations of their own making.

Personal and Local Loyalties. — The very intensity of the spirit of coöperation in family, manor, gild, and town, was hostile to the development of wider loyalties, particularly to any such thing as a national patriotism. The serf in Germany might be very loyal to his family, to his manor, and even to his lord. The craftsman in Italy might be intensely loyal to his family, his gild, and his city. But neither the serf nor the craftsman had much feeling about Germany as a whole or about Italy as a whole. So long as his intimate and local loyalties were not interfered with, he troubled

himself very little about a king or emperor or about his own nationality.

The Church and Morality. — The chief cement which held manors and towns together and which united all families throughout western and central Europe in a common social life was the Christian Church. The Church taught that the precepts of Jesus should be applied not only to the private life of the individual but to the public life of the community, and that it was the duty of the Church to interpret those precepts. For this purpose an elaborate "moral theology" was constructed by eminent Christian writers and professional "moral theologians," and was embodied in decrees of popes, bishops, and Church synods and councils. It was not always lived up to, but it was an ideal.

Business Morality. — In business life "good and honest workmanship" and "fair dealing" were regarded as principles of Christian morality. It was considered immoral to charge more than the "just price." A craftsman should receive for his manufactures only enough to recompense him for the cost of the raw material and to provide a decent family-wage for himself and his helpers. Unnecessary raising of prices and the use of short weights and short measures were condemned. Profits were frowned upon, and the taking of interest on loans was forbidden to Christians.[1] Such, at any rate, was the theory and the ideal, but it was frequently disregarded in practice.

Social Classes. — Social classes were clearly marked in the Middle Age. Clergymen were a distinct class — sometimes called a first class, or First Estate. Noblemen were another class — a second class, or Second Estate. Agricultural tenants — the peasants — were a lower class. Merchants and craftsmen and townsmen generally (the bourg-dwellers, or "bourgeoisie" — bōōr′-zhwȧ′zē′ — as they were collectively styled in France) were still another class. Furthermore, each of these major classes had

[1] The taking of interest was called "usury," and in the earlier part of the Middle Age usury was largely confined to the Jews. In the later part of the Middle Age, the moral theologians recognized a distinction between high, unfair interest, and low, fair interest; the former continued to be called "usury" and to be prohibited to Christians; the latter was gradually permitted as legitimate "interest."

subdivisions. There was social cleavage between city bishops and country parish-priests. There was social cleavage between great nobles (dukes, counts, etc.) and lesser nobles (barons, country gentlemen, and knights). There was social cleavage between free peasants and villeins. There was social cleavage between wealthy merchants and ordinary craftsmen, and between journeymen and peddlers — and beggars.

But social classes were bound together, as we have seen, by economic interests and sacred contracts; all men, regardless of class, were equals in church; and the most humble villager or townsman might rise, and sometimes did rise, to high position on the manor or in the gild, and especially so in the Church organization. A considerable number of Popes in the Middle Age came from families that were artisans or peasants. Class distinctions were taken for granted; but this did not mean that a member of one class was servile or cringing before a member of a higher class. In the Middle Age a cat might stare at a king, and neither king nor cat would be the worse for it.

Condition of the Masses. — As we have already pointed out, life in the Middle Age, whether in town or in country, was not very comfortable for the vast mass of people. Many things which we think of nowadays as necessities of decent living were then deemed luxuries for a few, and many of our luxuries were quite unknown to our medieval ancestors. Yet while physical comforts were few, the masses normally had enough to eat and managed to live in some degree of contentment and self-respect. As a usual thing, there was little unemployment either in city or in country. Occasionally — and the occasions were more frequent in the Middle Age than in modern times — a famine or an epidemic would kill off large numbers of people and reduce an entire community to the verge of starvation. Every once in a while, feudal warfare would produce a similar result.

Care of the Sick and Poor. — Much was done, chiefly by the Church, to relieve poverty and sickness. Hospitals for lepers and other diseased persons, houses for orphans and widows, institutions for the blind, for cripples, and for the insane, were everywhere established and maintained. Every monastery had a special

official, an "almoner," in charge of its charitable work. He was admonished to be "prudent and discreet" in the distribution of doles (or alms), and to give chief attention to needy travellers, beggars, and lepers. He was to visit and assist the old and infirm, lame and blind, who were confined to their beds. In his special section of the monastery (the almonry) there were usually rooms for the sick. The sick in their own homes were cared for at the almoner's discretion. All the remnants of meals and the old clothes of the monks were given to the almoner for distribution, and at Christmas he had a store of stockings and other articles to give away as presents to widows and orphans.

Monastic Hospitality. — Hospitality was considered a duty and a virtue. Bishops, parish-priests, and monks were expected, from their funds, to furnish something like hotel accommodations for strangers and travellers. Every monastery maintained, apart from the rest of the house, a dormitory, dining-room, and kitchen for travellers; a special official attended to their needs, and the brothers waited on them. Guests who were laymen might stay on indefinitely, provided they would work in return for their board and lodging. The medieval monasteries were at once inns, farm-houses, and educational and charitable institutions; and though sometimes their charity was rather indiscriminate and gave rise to abuses, such as the development of more or less professional beggars who did no honest work and got a living by begging from monastery to monastery and from house to house, nevertheless the medieval monasteries supplemented, as nothing else could or did supplement, the social life of the time and filled a social need.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. In what sense is the term "European Middle Age" used in this book?

2. Give an account of the origin and principal characteristics of the feudalism that flourished in the European Middle Age. Do you recall anything resembling this feudalism in the history of Egypt, Assyria, Greece, Rome, China, or India?

3. What reciprocal rights and privileges were assumed by persons who entered into a feudal contract? In a modern state is the relation between the citizen and the magistrates based upon a contract?

4. Discuss the advantages and the disadvantages of feudalism.

5. What was chivalry?

6. Describe the methods of agriculture in the European Middle Age. If you can, show how these methods must have affected the daily life of the peasantry. Compare medieval agricultural methods with the methods employed today in the United States.

7. What services and payments was the villein or serf obligated to render to the lord of the manor?

8. Why did medieval cities value their "charters"? Describe the growth of towns in the Middle Age.

9. Distinguish between merchant and craft gilds, and explain the organization and functions of each.

10. Contrast daily life in a medieval city with life in ancient Athens, in ancient Rome, or in a modern city.

11. What social classes existed in the Middle Age? Were they the same social classes that existed in Athens and in Rome? Do they still exist?

12. In what ways was Christian moral theology applied to business?

13. What social or economic functions were fulfilled by the monasteries in the Middle Age?

SPECIAL TOPICS

The manor. KNIGHT, *Economic History of Europe*, I, 163–197; PROTHEROE, *English Farming Past and Present*, chs. i–ii; USHER, *Industrial History of England*, chs. iv–v; CHEYNEY, *Industrial and Social History of England*, ch. ii; LIPSON, *Economic History of England*, ch. ii; SIMKHOVITCH, "Hay and History" (in *Toward the Understanding of Jesus*, 140–165); DAVIS, *Life on a Medieval Barony*, ch. xvi; HONE, *The Manor and Manorial Records*, ch. vi; GRAS, *History of Agriculture*, 78–96; WHITE AND NOTESTEIN, *Source Problems in English History*, 109–157.

Black Death and Peasants' Rebellion. CHEYNEY, *Industrial and Social History of England*, ch. v; GRAS, *History of Agriculture*, ch. v.

Gilds. KNIGHT, *Economic History*, I, 205–208, 215–226, 234–239; LIPSON, *Economic History*, chs. vii–viii; THORNDIKE, *Medieval Europe*, 314–319.

Town life and business. MUNRO, *Middle Ages*, ch. xxix; BEARD, *English Historians*, 185–203; KNIGHT, *Economic History*, I, 108–128; PIRENNE, *Medieval Cities*, chs. iv, vii; CRUMP AND JACOB, *Legacy of the Middle Ages*, ch. viii; BOISSONNADE, *Life and Work in Medieval Europe*, 205–225.

Feudalism and the life of nobles. MUNRO, *Middle Ages*, 126–137, 311–318; DAVIS, *Life on a Medieval Barony*, ch. iv; ROBINSON, *Readings*, I, ch. ix.

Women in the Middle Age. DAVIS, *Life on a Medieval Barony*, ch. v; CRUMP AND JACOB, *Legacy of the Middle Ages*, ch. vii.

Tournaments and battles. DAVIS, *Life on a Medieval Barony*, chs. xiii–xiv; SCOTT, *Ivanhoe*, chs. vii–ix.

Chivalry. TAYLOR, *Mediæval Mind*, I, ch. xxii; HUIZINGA, *Waning of the Middle Ages*, 56–94.

A castle. DAVIS, *Life on a Medieval Barony*, ch. ii.

Amusements. GASQUET, *Parish Life*, ch. xi.

Industrial methods. SALZMAN, *English Industries of the Middle Ages*, ch. ii (iron), ix (cloth), xiii (regulation of industry).

A fair. DAVIS, *Life on a Medieval Barony*, ch. xxii; LIPSON, *Economic History*, ch. vi.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THE TEACHER

W. S. DAVIS, *Life on a Medieval Barony*. L. THORNDIKE, *Medieval Europe*. P. BOISSONNADE, *Life and Work in Medieval Europe*. A. ABRAM, *English Life and Manners in the Later Middle Ages*. C. SEIGNOBOS, *Feudal Régime*. L. GAUTIER, *Chivalry*. W. C. MELLER, *Knight's Life*. J. W. THOMPSON, "German Feudalism" in *Amer. Hist. Rev.*, xxviii, 440–474; E. P. CHEYNEY, *Social and Industrial History of England*. P. VINOGRADOFF, *Growth of the Manor*. N. J. HONE, *Manor and Manorial Records*. E. POWER, *Medieval People*. L. F. SALZMAN, *English Industries of the Middle Ages*. H. PIRENNE, *Medieval Cities*. G. C. CRUMP AND E. F. JACOB, *Legacy of the Middle Ages*. G. G. COULTON, *Medieval Village*.

CONVENIENT SOURCE MATERIALS

J. H. ROBINSON, *Readings in European History*, I. O. J. THATCHER and E. H. MCNEAL, *Source Book for Medieval History*. R. T. DAVIES, *Documents Illustrating the History of Civilization in Medieval England*. A. E. BLAND, A. BROWN, AND R. H. TAWNEY, *English Economic History, Select Documents*. THE LITTLE FLOWERS AND THE LIFE OF ST. FRANCIS, (*Everyman's Library*). G. G. COULTON, *A Medieval Garner*.

EUROPE EARLY IN THE

IDDLE AGE, 1095 A.D.

CHAPTER XVII

GOVERNMENT IN THE MIDDLE AGE

Some General Remarks on Medieval Government

Contrast with Modern States. — We are used nowadays to large, strong, independent National States, such as France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, the United States, etc., each with a government capable of enforcing law and maintaining order throughout its territories. Certain affairs, including religion, are left to private action, but a great many matters, including even education, are controlled by public officials. So used are we to our present ideas and practices of government that we may find it difficult to comprehend the very different ideas and practices which obtained in western Europe from the eleventh to the fourteenth century.

A Political Crazy-Quilt. — If we were to draw a political map of medieval Europe, we would have to show not thirty National States, like France, Italy, Germany, etc., but hundreds and even thousands of duchies, counties, city-states, bishop-states, etc. — in France, for example, duchies of Normandy, Burgundy, Bourbon, Guienne, and Gascony, and counties of Paris, Champagne, Anjou, Poitiers, Blois, Artois, and Valois; in Italy, duchies of Savoy and Milan, city-states of Venice, Genoa, Florence, and Siena, bishop-states of the Pope, and a "kingdom" of Sicily and Naples (the "Two Sicilies"); and in Germany, duchies of Bavaria, Austria, Saxony, Silesia, and Luxemburg, counties of Württemberg and Tyrol, margravates of Brandenburg and Lusatia, bishop-states of Cologne, Mainz, Trier, Strasbourg, Munster, Utrecht, Magdeburg, and Salzburg, and city-states of Hamburg, Lübeck, Bremen, Ratisbon, Nuremberg, Worms, Spires, and Frankfort. These are just a few samples of the multitude of blocks which made up the crazy-quilt of political Europe in the Middle Age. Some of these blocks were extremely small and others fairly large. Some had

republican government and others had aristocratic or monarchic government.

Feudal Government. — A very common type of medieval state was a duchy or county, comprising a group of manors and frequently some towns, in feudal vassalage to a duke or count. The head of such a state — the count or duke — would usually have a capital (which was his castle), a court, an army (of feudal knights and hired soldiers), and a sort of parliament or local "Estates," composed of representatives from the clergy, the manors, and the towns, whom he would summon to his castle to advise him from time to time. With the consent of the "Estates" he would make laws and levy taxes and govern his territory. Every feudal suzerain (duke, count, abbot, bishop, etc.) could issue laws, levy taxes, coin money, declare war, conclude treaties, and try cases in his court.

The history of most of these feudal states during the Middle Age would be dull and tiresome and repetitious. It would tell how they were frequently partitioned among the sons of a count or duke, by will or through rebellion, and how they were as frequently reunited and enlarged by marriage or by conquest. It would also relate how the dukes and counts were in chronic conflict and feudal war with their vassals, the towns and manorial lords, on the one hand, and with their own suzerains, the kings and emperors, on the other hand. In some countries, notably England and France, the kings eventually got the upper hand and consolidated the duchies and counties into National States. In other countries, notably Italy and Germany, the dukes and counts retained a large degree of practical independence from emperor and king, though they were generally compelled to grant almost complete freedom to the towns in their dominions.

Plan of This Chapter. — The nature of the political government of feudal lords, whether dukes and counts, or bishops and abbots, should be clear to us from our study of feudalism in the preceding chapter. The nature of the City-States and National States, which supplemented and gradually supplanted the governments of feudal lords, we shall discuss in later sections of the present chapter. It will be necessary also to devote a section to the Church, which

had important political functions, and a section to the Empire, which claimed to be the heir of the ancient Roman Empire.

The Church

How the Church Was Organized. — It will be difficult to explain how the Church was involved in questions of government during the Middle Age, unless we first know something of its system of organization and some of the terms which must be used. The head of the Church, as we remember, was the bishop of Rome, styled the Pope or Sovereign Pontiff. For the local administration of Church affairs, the lands inhabited by Catholic Christians (and in the Middle Age that meant chiefly western, central, and northern Europe) were divided into provinces, dioceses, and parishes. The province was a fairly large district, centering in an important city and supervised by an archbishop or metropolitan. The diocese was a subdivision of a province, and comprised a town or city, with a certain amount of surrounding country, under the supervision of a bishop. The parish was a subdivision of a diocese, and usually included only a single church, with the village or section of a city in which the people attending that church lived. Each parish had a priest to say Mass and administer the sacraments; and in important parishes there might be assistant priests and deacons. All these clergymen — archbishops, bishops, priests, and deacons — taken

A Bishop in His Official Chair

The official chair of a bishop was called (in Latin) a *cathedra;* and the principal church of a diocese, in which a *cathedra* was placed, was therefore called a cathedral church. The bishop has a crozier in his left hand.

together are styled the "hierarchy" (hī′ĕr-är′kĭ) or *secular* clergy. They are called secular because they lived and labored in the world (*sæcula*, in Latin).

The Regular Clergy.—The *regular* clergy consisted of monks, friars, and nuns who "withdrew from the world" and lived according to a religious "rule" (*regula*, in Latin). There were several varieties of regular clergy.

SAINT FRANCIS AND SAINT DOMINIC
As represented by a later Italian painter, Benozzo Gozzoli.

(1) The Benedictine monks and nuns lived in fixed monasteries or nunneries, usually connected with large farms or estates, and followed the Rule written by Benedict[1] in the sixth century. They tilled the soil, copied manuscripts, and conducted schools and charities. Most of the Benedictine monasteries and nunneries were separate units, each being under its own abbot, who owed no superior allegiance except to the Pope; the Cluniac Benedictines,[2] however, were a federation of scattered monasteries under a common government.

(2) The Crusading Orders sprang up in the twelfth century. They were organized on a military basis and attended the Crusaders,[3] caring for the sick and wounded and for the Holy Places

[1] See pp. 462–464. [2] See pp. 563–564. [3] See pp. 649–654.

associated with incidents in the life of Jesus. Such Orders were the Knights Templars and the Teutonic Knights.

(3) The Friars or Mendicant (Begging) Orders had at first no fixed abodes but wandered from place to place, preaching to the common people and depending upon alms for their own living. These Orders came into prominence in the thirteenth century and included, among others, (1) the Franciscan, or Order of the Friars Minor, whose lovable founder, Francis of Assisi (1182–1226), urged humility and love of the poor, and (2) the Dominican, or Order of the Preachers, devoted by the precept of its practical founder, Dominic (1170–1221), to missionary zeal.

Most of the regular clergy took the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. All the Mendicant Orders, as well as the Benedictine, became famous in the history of education, and the majority of the distinguished scholars of the Middle Age were monks or friars. It was not uncommon, moreover, for regulars to enter the secular hierarchy and thus become parish-priests or bishops, even Popes.

A Factor in Government. — The chief function of the Church in the Middle Age was, of course, to provide for the religious life of the people, as churches do to-day. It conducted church ceremonies, administered the sacraments, and endeavored to promote faith and morality. But the needs of the people and the weakness of political governments in the Dark Age and the Middle Age led the Church to fulfill other functions, also.

(1) As we have seen, the monasteries took the place of hotels for travellers, and provided for the sick, the aged, and the poor. (2) Education was conducted entirely by the Church, for there were no public schools. Monks did all the writing and copying of books, for there were no printing presses or publishers. (3) Moreover, the Church in the Middle Age exercised important powers which are now considered functions of the government. The Church even had its own system of courts and of law.[1] The

[1] The Church law, consisting of decrees or "canons" issued by the Pope or enacted by General Councils with his consent, was known as canon law. Of the several compilations or codes of canon law which were made, the one prepared by a monk named Gratian (grā′shĭ-ŭn), in the twelfth century, was the most widely used.

Church courts tried not only all cases involving clergymen, but also certain kinds of cases which concerned laymen, such as disputes regarding marriage, wills, blasphemy, etc. Many bishops and abbots, thanks to their position as feudal suzerains, were rulers of fairly large territories, and had the rights of legislation, coinage, taxation, etc. The Pope himself was the ruler of the city of Rome and of the Papal States in central Italy. In short, the Church was a very important factor in government during the Middle Age.

Effect of Feudalism on the Church. — The very fact that the Church was so deeply involved in political matters gave rise to grave problems, problems which were the more serious, since Christian civilization had not yet fully recovered from the Dark Age of barbarian invasions. The pagan barbarians, to be sure, had been converted, and their descendants were beginning to become civilized, but the masses were still ignorant, and many of the warlike feudal nobles, Christians though they might be in name, were little better than barbarians at heart. As late as the eleventh century, the Church was still trying to teach such warriors not to break into churches, or injure monks, or fight on feast days.[1]

To feudal lords of this sort, the very extensive landed property of the Church was an almost irresistible temptation. Sometimes they seized Church lands by force. More often, they tried to control Church property by securing the election of their relatives and henchmen to Church offices. Abbots and bishops, it must be remembered, were suzerains of large territories from which they received considerable incomes. That is the reason why ambitious feudal lords, kings, and emperors constantly were attempting to dictate the choice of abbots and bishops, and too often putting into these offices men who were not at all fitted to be officials of the Church, men lacking in piety, and sometimes even in morality. This abuse affected even the papacy itself in the tenth and early eleventh centuries.

Other Abuses in the Church. — Another abuse was the attempt of unscrupulous persons to bribe or buy their way into church offices, and then to enrich themselves and their relatives. The pur-

[1] See p. 530.

chase of church offices was denounced by reformers, who indignantly named it "simony" (sĭm′ō-nĭ; the word is derived from the name of Simon Magus, who was rebuked by the Apostle Peter for offering to purchase the power of the Holy Ghost).

Still another difficulty arose in connection with the celibacy (sĕl′ĭ-bȧ-sĭ) of the clergy (that is, the rule that the clergy should not marry). Celibacy had not always been the rule: some of the early Apostles and bishops (notably the Apostle Peter) were married, and in the East it had always been (and still is) customary for priests to marry. In Western Europe, however, Popes and Church synods in the fourth and fifth centuries had urged all the clergy to remain unmarried, that is, celibate. The rule was difficult to enforce, and was often violated, especially in the case of worldly nobles who had secured church offices by means of political influence or by "simony."

THE CHURCH OF THE MONASTERY OF CLUNY

Cluny and the Reform Movement. — An agitation against these abuses was conducted by various monks, and particularly by the monks of Cluny. In the little village of Cluny, in east-central France, a monastery or abbey had been founded in the tenth century, and had become famous for its high standard of piety and

education. Large numbers of monasteries in western Europe affiliated themselves with Cluny and adopted its rule of monastic life (a modification of the Benedictine Rule). Men trained in these monasteries, or in the schools attached to them, won respect everywhere for their integrity and zeal. From Cluny a great reform movement radiated out through Europe, combating "simony" and other abuses. It received special encouragement and practical assistance from several Holy Roman Emperors.

The College of Cardinals. — By the middle of the eleventh century, reforming Popes took the leadership in the movement against "simony," against political control of the Church, and against the marriage of clergymen. A very important reform adopted at this time was the decree of Pope Nicholas II, in the year 1059, that future Popes should not be nominated either by an Emperor or by the aristocratic families in Rome, but should be elected by the College of Cardinals — a body of Roman bishops, priests, and deacons.[1] This manner of election tended to place better men in office, and to make them more independent of outside interference.

Hildebrand. — The greatest of the reforming Popes of the eleventh century was Gregory VII, or, as he is sometimes called by his family name, Hildebrand (hĭl′dĕ-brănd). Hildebrand was thoroughly in sympathy with the work of the Cluniac Benedictines and efficiently served several reforming Popes, including Leo IX and Nicholas II, as secretary and adviser. He was elected Pope himself in 1073 and at once raised the Papacy to a position of influence and power which it had scarcely possessed since the time of his early predecessor and namesake Gregory I (Gregory the Great).[2] Gregory VII was one of the most remarkable Popes whom we meet in history. He was sincere, upright, and unafraid. His bright, flashing eyes were outward signs of a keen intelligence and an unbreakable will. He was likened by his contemporaries to the ancient Hebrew prophet Elijah, and, like Elijah, Gregory VII

[1] In later times, the Popes adopted the practice of appointing certain numbers of distinguished foreigners (usually bishops) as Cardinals, instead of conferring this honor exclusively upon natives of Rome or of Italy.

[2] See p. 467.

was fierce in denouncing wrong, vigorous in action, unshaken in adversity, and confident in the eventual triumph of his cause.

The Investiture Conflict and Canossa. — In his efforts to improve the government of the Church, Gregory VII found himself in conflict with the Emperor on the question of "investiture." If emperors and kings were allowed to appoint bishops and abbots and confer investiture upon them (presenting them with a ring and crozier as emblems of office), it would be impossible for the Pope either to control the clergy or to insist upon high spiritual and moral standards in the Church. Gregory forbade any lay ruler — even the Emperor — to confer investiture upon Church officials.

A storm of opposition arose, particularly in Germany and northern Italy. Emperor Henry IV (1056–1106) refused obedience and tried to depose the Pope. Gregory retaliated by excommunicating[1] the Emperor. Soon Henry IV found himself confronted by rebellion in Germany. In alarm he hastened over winter snows to meet the Pope in the Italian castle of Canossa, and sue for pardon. As an object lesson to other rulers, Gregory refused to receive Henry IV back into the Church or to recognize him as Emperor until he had stood for three days barefooted and clad only in the rough woollen garb of a sorrowful sinner, in the cold courtyard of Canossa. That was in the year 1077. But after he left Canossa, Henry IV did not live up to his promises. The conflict was renewed. Feudal lords took sides in the dispute, and for years civil war raged in Germany. Gregory VII was actually driven from Rome, and died in exile (1085) saying, "I have loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore I die in exile."

Many years later, the reform for which Gregory had contended was accomplished. By the Concordat (treaty) of Worms (a city in Germany), signed in the year 1122, the Emperor agreed not to interfere in the election of Church officials, and not to invest them with ring and crozier.

[1] Excommunication meant expulsion from the Church. Another measure occasionally used by the Pope in his struggles with rulers was the "interdict," a sort of Church strike, which stopped the holding of religious services and administering of sacraments in the country where it was declared. Occasionally, too, the Pope deposed a ruler, that is to say, he released the ruler's subjects from their normal duty of allegiance to that ruler.

Innocent III. — Thanks to the outcome of the investiture conflict, the Popes of the next century were able to exert great influence and power and to put forth extraordinary claims. Per-

Pope Innocent III Approving the Rule of Saint Francis
From a painting of Giotto, the greatest painter of the Middle Age.

haps the high-water mark of papal influence was reached with Innocent III (1198–1216), who claimed that although "to princes power is given on earth," the clergy have a superior kind of power, since they deal with souls, while princes deal only with the bodies of men. It was the ambition of Innocent III to make the Pope the supreme governor and monarch of all Christian nations. With vigorous statesmanship he sought to make good his claims.

Of all his political successes, the most famous was his victory over King John of England. When King John ventured to oppose the appointment of Stephen Langton as archbishop of Canterbury, Innocent threatened a crusade against him. Finally King John consented (1213) not only to recognize Archbishop Langton, but also to hold England and Ireland as fiefs of the Papacy and to pay annual tribute. Thus Innocent became feudal suzerain, so to speak, of England.

He also more or less influenced, as suzerain, the rulers of the kingdom of Sicily and Naples, Sardinia, the Christian states in Spain, the Scandinavian states, the kingdom of Hungary, the Slav states of Bohemia, Poland, Serbia, Bosnia, and Bulgaria, and the Christian states founded in Syria by the Crusaders. So great was his political power, that a Byzantine visitor to Rome ironically declared Innocent III to be the successor "not of Peter but of Constantine." Before he died, Innocent III had the satisfaction of presiding over the twelfth General Council of the Catholic Church. Not only some 1500 archbishops, bishops, abbots, and other Church dignitaries, but also representatives of the Emperor and of kings and feudal princes, coming from all parts of Christendom, assembled in the Lateran Palace at Rome to hear and endorse the Pope's decrees.

Church Government and Feudal Government. — In endeavoring to prevent the Church from becoming subordinate to feudal lords, many Popes of the Middle Age took part in political controversies and exerted considerable political influence. This political influence was not to be permanent, nor was it an essential part of the Church. It was the product of the peculiar conditions existing in the Middle Age, when Europe was a hodge-podge of petty feudal states, and when many feudal rulers were illiterate, quar-

relsome, and unruly. Under such conditions, the Church supplemented feudal government by providing a bond of union, by supplying well-educated advisers for rulers who were often ignorant or incapable, and by endeavoring to restrain such rulers from their incessant wars against one another. In rendering this service, however, clergymen were too frequently and actively concerned in politics, and too often corrupted by worldly ambition. In the long run, the mass of Catholic Christians refused to recognize such extravagant political claims of the Papacy as had been put forward by Innocent III.

Spiritual Foundations. — Important as its political functions were, the Church did not depend for its strength primarily upon the machinery of government. It was not primarily or chiefly a government. It was essentially organized religion. Its greatness and power were the result of the faith of its members in its divine mission. It claimed to be, and was accepted as being, the Church established by Jesus Christ to preach his gospel, to administer the sacraments, and to secure for humanity eternal happiness in the life beyond the grave. Outside the Church, it was believed, no one could be sure of salvation, and inside the Church only those would be saved who obeyed the laws of God. As long as the majority of the people truly believed this, the Church was sure to be loyally supported.

Heretics and the Inquisition. — There were in the Middle Age, as in earlier times, some persons who insisted upon holding religious doctrines contrary to those of the Church. Such persons, as the reader will remember, were known as "heretics."

Heretics were regarded with indignation and horror in Europe in the Middle Age. While Dominican friars zealously endeavored to convert them, and with some success, the Church burned heretical books, and forbade Catholics to marry heretics or even to have business dealings with them. And that was not all. It is difficult for modern readers to understand how strong the spirit of intolerance was. Heretics were regarded as dangerous persons, because they might lead others into error; heresy was regarded as a contagious disease, worse than any other, because those affected by it were in danger of losing their souls. Moreover,

heresy in religion was often connected with opposition to the economic system, or to government, and therefore heretics were regarded somewhat as anarchists and traitors are regarded nowadays. As traitors are put to death, occasionally, in the twentieth century, so heretics were put to death in the Middle Age.

A special court to try heretics was established in the thirteenth century. It is known in history as the Inquisition. Its members were monks appointed by the Pope or by a bishop. As was usual



THE LATERAN PALACE AT ROME IN THE MIDDLE AGE

The residence and offices of the Popes and their court, and the meeting-place of several General Councils of the Catholic Church.

in law courts of that period, the Inquisition conducted its proceedings in secret and used torture to extort confessions from the accused and evidence from witnesses. Heretics found guilty were sentenced to fasting and prayer, or to fines or imprisonment in some cases, but if they proved obstinate or if they were renegades, they were "handed over to the secular arm." That is to say, they were handed over to the government (the king, duke, count, or whatever ruler had authority in the region). And the government, with the sanction of the clergy, dealt with them, in many instances, by burning them at the stake.

In the thirteenth century, moreover, the Pope preached a Crusade against the Albigenses (ăl′bĭ-jĕn′sēz), a heretical sect in southern France; and the Albigensian heresy was blotted out partially by the ensuing war, partially by the Inquisition, and partially by the preaching of Dominican friars.

The Jews in Europe. — Of course there were some people in Western Europe who were not Christians at all. There were Moslems in Spain, and there were Jews in the larger towns in many countries. Against the Moslems, the Church preached Crusades, as we shall see. The Jews, on the other hand, were tolerated by the Church and exempt from the Inquisition; they were allowed to have their own synagogues and rabbis and to practise their religion. But there was great popular prejudice against them. They were usually obliged to live in a certain part of the town (the ghetto), and to wear a distinctive badge. While they were permitted to act as traders and bankers, most other occupations were closed to them. Often they suffered from hoodlums and rioters. And occasionally a king would banish all the Jews from his country: they were banished from England in 1290 and from France in 1306.

Religious Intolerance. — It is tragic that the Christians of the Middle Age should have forgotten that the founder of their religion had been himself a victim of religious intolerance, and that Christianity had made great advances during the early centuries of its existence without any use of force on its part and in the face of bitter persecution on the part of the pagan government of the Roman Empire. In explanation of the attitude of medieval Christians, though not as an apology for it, we may suggest that religious intolerance, and the forcing of people to adhere to the religion of the majority, had been deeply implanted in mankind throughout a very, very long antiquity, and that the Middle Age was too brief to admit of an uprooting of such long-established human habits. It should be borne in mind that what we call religious liberty is a recent and still a precarious achievement. It is not ancient, or medieval, or early modern: it is very modern. When all is said and done, however, the student of history can indeed be glad that nowadays Christians do not burn one another.



THE HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY

In this respect, at any rate, there has been progress since the Middle Age, though the progress of toleration may have been more marked in the case of religion than in that of government.

The Empire

Origin of Holy Roman Empire. — The Holy Roman Empire, like the Catholic Church, claimed to embrace all Christendom. It aspired to be, in the political realm, what the Church was in the spiritual realm. It insisted that it was the true successor to the ancient Christian Roman Empire. A great gulf existed, however, between what the Holy Roman Empire claimed to be and what it actually was. As we have already pointed out,[1] the Holy Roman Empire of the Middle Age was not a direct continuation of the ancient Roman Empire. The only direct continuation of the ancient Empire was the Greek-Roman (or Byzantine) Empire with its medieval capital at Constantinople. In western Europe there had actually been no Empire from the time of the German invasions in the fifth century until the coronation of Charlemagne as "Roman Emperor" by the Pope in the year 800. Even this Carolingian Empire was unstable and short-lived.

What the Pope called into being in the year 962, when he crowned the Saxon King of Germany, Otto the Great, as Holy Roman Emperor, was really a new Empire under the old name. The Holy Roman Empire, at its greatest extent, embraced Germany, the Netherlands, Bohemia (Czechoslovakia), Austria, Switzerland, Burgundy, and most of Italy. It never included France, England, Spain, the Scandinavian countries, or Hungary.

The German Kingdom. — The Holy Roman Empire of Otto I and his successors was built upon the Kingdom of Germany, which had been practically separated from the Carolingian Empire by the Treaty of Verdun (843). Otto himself was, first and foremost, King of Germany, and after his time whoever was King of Germany was normally Holy Roman Emperor.

If the German Kings had confined their efforts to Germany they might have laid the foundations in the Middle Age for a strong German National State, similar to the National States which were

[1] See p. 495.

then in process of formation in England and France. But by personal ambition, by dreams of the old Roman Empire, and by pleas of the Popes, they were lured away from what was practical to what was visionary. They sought to put an Empire on top of their German Kingdom, and as the result they built a queer thing which was an Empire only in name.

The Emperors. — The head of the Empire was elected by the princes and was styled "German King" or "King of the Romans" until he was crowned by the Pope; thereafter he was "Roman Emperor." An Emperor usually tried to secure the election of his son as King during his own lifetime so that upon his death the son might succeed him, and in this way the imperial title was kept in particular families for fairly long periods. For example, the Saxon line of Otto the Great reigned from 962 to 1002; the Franconian line, from 1024 to 1125; the Hohenstaufens, from 1138 to 1254; and the Habsburgs, from 1273 to 1291 and again from 1437 to 1806.

In theory the Holy Roman Emperor had the same powers which the ancient Emperors — a Constantine or a Theodosius — had had. In fact, however, he was little more than a feudal lord, possessing only such authority as he could derive from his personal estates or persuade his vassals to give him. And his vassals were not anxious to weaken their authority in order to strengthen his; indeed they had special opportunities to increase their power at his expense. Under feudalism, as we have seen, every chief vassal had sovereign rights; he commanded an army, made laws, coined money, administered justice, declared war, and concluded peace; and within the Holy Roman Empire there were hundreds of such vassals, each with a state and a government of his own. The Emperor simply could not dominate all these states. If he centered his efforts in Germany, Italian states rebelled against him; if he stayed long enough in Italy to establish his authority there, then the princes in Germany behaved as absolutely independent rulers.

The Electors. — Certain vassals elected the "German King" (and, hence, indirectly, the Holy Roman Emperor) and were known therefore as "Electors" or "Electoral Princes." The number varied somewhat at different times but was finally fixed at seven by a famous decree, called the Golden Bull (1356). The

seven Electors were the Archbishops of Mainz, Trier, and Cologne, the King of Bohemia, the Count Palatine of the Rhine, the Duke of Saxony, and the Margrave of Brandenburg. These Electors were particularly powerful: they were guaranteed full sovereign rights within their dominions; and they used their right of election in order to obtain from the man whom they elected solemn pledges and concessions which constantly decreased the power of the Emperor and increased their own and that of their fellow princes, the dukes and counts and margraves of the Holy Roman Empire.

NUREMBERG, A GERMAN CITY IN THE MIDDLE AGE

Free Cities. — Then, too, cities became very important in the Holy Roman Empire, especially the cities in northern Italy and in the valleys of the Rhine and Main and along the North Sea and Baltic. These cities wrested charters and privileges from Emperor and princes and developed a large measure of self-government, and, as the power of the Emperor declined, they became really independent republics. To maintain their privileges and independence, they formed military alliances and political leagues with one

another, and thereby further weakened the unity of the Empire and the authority of the Emperor.[1]

Petty Vassals. — In addition to the free cities and the great Electors and the princes, there were in Germany numerous petty knights or barons who in theory were immediate vassals of the Emperor and in practice were petty sovereigns in their petty domains. They often possessed little more than a castle perched on some hill, and they lived mainly on the plunder of passing travellers and traders. They recognized no law save their own will, and they were ever a source of disorder and weakness to the Empire.

Frequency of Civil Wars. — Private war between Electors and princes, on one side, and free cities, on the other, was common. Common also were attacks by "robber" barons both upon the merchants of free cities and upon the fields of princes. Military leagues for offense, as well as for defense, were formed not only by free cities but by princes and Electors, and were directed against one another and against the Emperor quite as much as against robber barons. Occasionally an extraordinary Emperor would temporarily repress private war and bring order out of chaos. All Emperors had to fight in order to maintain any authority.

The Diet. — The Holy Roman Empire evolved in the Middle Age a kind of parliament, or Diet as it was termed. The Diet was not elected by universal suffrage, as are our modern parliaments, but it did represent certain classes and interests in the Empire. It comprised three chambers, or "colleges": the College of Electors; the College of Princes, both spiritual and temporal; and the College of Representatives of the Free Cities. It met from time to time, usually at Frankfort, on the call of the Emperor, in order to counsel and assist him; but, as a matter of fact, the Diet proved to be still another source of weakness, rather than of strength, to the Empire. Each "college" served its own interests first, and those of the Empire afterwards. A jealous regard for the rights of each separate state within the Empire ("particularism," the Germans called it) was uppermost in the minds of the members of the Diet and usually paralyzed any effective common action.

[1] See p. 585.

The Investiture Conflict. — What brought out all the political and social weaknesses of the Empire and finally reduced it to impotence was the series of controversies and conflicts during the Middle Age between Emperors and Popes, between Empire and Church. The first of these conflicts raged over the question of lay investiture during the reigns of the Franconian Emperors Henry IV (1056–1106) and Henry V (1106–1125). We have already seen how this struggle led to the humiliation of Henry IV at Canossa, the exile of Pope Gregory VII, and the Concordat of Worms.[1] We may now add that it greatly weakened the prestige and power of the Emperor.

HENRY IV AT CANOSSA

From a manuscript of the twelfth century, now in the Vatican Library at Rome. Henry IV is the kneeling figure in the foreground; the seated figure to the left of him is Gregory VII; and the woman on the right is the Countess Matilda, a supporter of the Pope against the Emperor.

Barbarossa. — The next great struggle came in the reign of the Hohenstaufen Emperor Frederick I (1152–1190). Frederick, who had such a fine red beard that he is known in history as Barbarossa (the "Red-Bearded"), was a brave and skillful warrior, resolutely determined to restore peace and order throughout the Empire and to win general recognition of his supreme authority. He did assure a large measure of internal peace and prosperity to Germany; he asserted imperial supremacy over Denmark, Poland, and Hungary, entered into

[1] See p. 565.

friendly relations with the Byzantine Emperor at Constantinople, and made treaties with the Kings of England and France.

With the Pope, however, Frederick I encountered difficulties. The Pope insisted that the Church was superior to the Empire; Frederick held that the Empire was superior to the Church. The Pope at the time was the fearless Alexander III, who did not hesitate to excommunicate the ambitious Emperor (1160). Frederick defied the Pope's action, and, supported by the majority of the laity and even of the clergy in Germany, proceeded to lead a military expedition into Italy and, after driving Alexander from Rome, to install in the capital of Christendom a rival Pope of his own choosing.

Victory of the Lombard League. — Nevertheless, it was not long until Pope Alexander III received assistance. Frederick I had appointed governors (called "podestas") over his cities in northern Italy, and these cities, resenting the subordination of their local governments to personal agents of the Emperor, formed a league — the Lombard League — to free themselves from Frederick and his podestas. Naturally, Pope Alexander espoused the cause of the Lombard League. Then, when actual war broke out between Frederick and the League, the Emperor's most powerful vassal in Germany — the duke of Saxony and Bavaria and head of the Welf (or Guelph) family — refused to help him. In 1176, at the battle of Legnano (lā-nyä′nō), Frederick I was wounded and decisively beaten. The next year, by the treaty of Venice, Frederick recognized Alexander III as rightful Pope and the Pope released the Emperor from the ban of excommunication. Later, by the treaty of Constance (1183), Frederick made peace with the Lombard League and withdrew his podestas. Frederick Barbarossa, who had begun his reign with high worldly ambition, ended it fighting for Christianity — for he died on a Crusade to the Holy Land. He had failed to withstand the Church or permanently to check the disruptive forces within the Empire.

Frederick II. — The third great contest between Empire and Papacy was associated with the career of the Emperor Frederick II (1212–1250). This Frederick was the grandson of Frederick Barbarossa, and the son of the heiress of the Norman kingdom of

Sicily and Naples (the Two Sicilies). An interesting man he was. He was born and brought up in southern Italy, and his tastes and interests were more Italian than German. He was highly cultured and full of curiosity, the master of six languages, the patron of scholars and scientists, and the friend and protector of Moslems and Jews. An astute diplomatist and of doubtful religious orthodoxy, he was viewed with suspicion by the Popes of the time, and this suspicion developed into fear when it became clear that Frederick II was endeavoring to expand his kingdom of the Two Sicilies and to incorporate Italy in a single compact lay state. Such a state, the Popes felt, would imperil their own independence.

Consequently when Frederick II attacked and defeated the cities in northern Italy, the Pope made their cause his own and excommunicated the Emperor. For years war was waged with words and with arms. Both Italians and Germans were divided: those who followed the Pope were called Guelphs (gwĕlfs) or Welfs and those who sympathized with the Emperor were styled Ghibellines (gĭb′ĕl-ĭnz) or Waiblings (vī′blĭngs). Gradually the Guelphs got the upper hand. The imperial forces were driven out of North Italy, and a General Council of the Church, convened by the Pope at Lyons (1245), pronounced the deposition of Frederick II. When he died five years later, his Empire was shattered. Italy was completely lost, and in Germany a desperate struggle was going on between rival claimants for a crown which was now hardly ornamental.

The Empire without a Head. — With the passing of Frederick II passed the Hohenstaufen Emperors and the last chance of building a powerful united Empire in western Europe. From 1250 to 1273 the German Kingdom and the Holy Roman Empire (which now were practically identical) had no real head. It is true that in 1256 different Electors chose two kings of Germany — an English prince and a Spanish prince — but, though the English prince was solemnly crowned, no one paid much attention to him and the majority of his subjects were probably ignorant of his very name, while the Spanish prince did not even visit the country over which he pretended to rule. Actually, during these years, the Holy

Roman Empire was merely a medley of German states whose princes did as they pleased.

Rudolph of Habsburg. — It was only because the Pope threatened to appoint an Emperor if the Electors did not choose one, that the Electors in 1273 raised to the throne the head of the Habsburg family, Rudolph by name. Rudolph signalized his reign by securing for himself and his family the important duchy of Austria, centering in the city of Vienna; and Austria remained in Habsburg possession from 1278 to 1918.

Wars in Italy. — For a century and a half after Rudolph's death, "German Kings" were elected from various princely families in the Empire and were duly crowned as Holy Roman Emperors. Some of these Emperors, notably the Luxemburg Emperor Henry VII (1308–1313) and the Bavarian Emperor Louis IV (1314–1347), engaged in new military enterprises in Italy and in new controversies and conflicts with the Papacy. Henry VII was hailed by Ghibellines, especially by the great poet Dante (dän'tā), as the deliverer and unifier of the Italian nation; and Louis IV gained some temporary advantages over the Guelphs and the Papacy. But every strengthening of the Empire in Italy was accompanied by a weakening of it in Germany, and its strengthening in Italy was very temporary.

The Habsburg Emperors. — After 1437 the Habsburg dukes (or archdukes) of Austria were almost invariably elected "German Kings" and thus became "Holy Roman Emperors." The Habsburgs, as a rule, did not oppose the Papacy or seek to dominate Italy, and their influence in Germany proceeded far more from their power as hereditary rulers of Austria than from their position as elected Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire. The Empire, at the beginning of the Middle Age a political institution of imposing and promising character, was only a shadow at the close of the Age. And yet the shadow haunted men's minds throughout the Middle Age and far into Modern Times. Popes might quarrel with particular Emperors, but they always thought of a secular Empire as a needful adjunct to the Church. Kings and princes and republican cities might reject the authority of the Emperors, but they, also, long retained a respect for the name of Emperor.

Results of the Empire's Failure. — The Empire as a political institution was a magnificent dream and a colossal failure. Yet, though it failed to achieve its primary purpose, it contributed to the rise of other governmental agencies of considerable historical significance. (1) Its very failure permitted the free development of National States in Europe. If the Empire had been more powerful, it might have prevented Hungary, Poland, the Scandinavian countries, France, and even England from becoming separate and independent. Bohemia was the only non-German country which remained in the Empire, and Bohemia retained its own king (who was an Elector in the Empire) and its own national feelings. (2) From the private wars and the weakness of the Empire emerged certain strong princely families which established important hereditary states in Germany. The Habsburg family held Austria from 1278 to 1918. The Wittelsbach family secured Bavaria in 1180 and ruled it until 1918. The Hohenzollern family, originally "robber" barons, obtained Brandenburg in 1415 and used it as the foundation on which they constructed later the kingdom of Prussia and much later the German Empire of modern times. (3) It was in defiance of feudal lords of the Empire that hardy Germans in the valleys in the Alps banded together in 1291 and laid the basis for the federation of little mountain republics which nowadays we call Switzerland. (4) The weakness and failure of the Empire made it possible for cities both in Germany and in Italy to obtain independence and to erect city-states which played a very great rôle in government, in trade, in industry, and in art and learning.

German Expansion Eastward. — During the Middle Age, German influence spread eastward into lands which had long been Slavic. In the valley of the Oder and along the shores of the Baltic, as well as in Austria, the native Slav population adopted the German language and German customs. This was due partially to the political endeavors of the Holy Roman Emperors, partially to the military enterprise of German princes, partially to the commercial activities of the German cities, and partially to the religious zeal of German Catholic missionaries.

In this connection it is memorable that during the reign of the

Hohenstaufen Emperor Frederick II the semi-religious and semi-military Order of Teutonic Knights[1] changed the scene of its crusading efforts from Palestine to Prussia (1230). Prussia at that time was a country on the Baltic Sea north of Poland; its inhabitants were Slavs and, almost alone among the countries of Europe, it was still barbarous and pagan. Here the Teutonic Knights fought and conquered; here they established the state of Prussia, Christianizing and Germanizing it, and extending its sway over the territory which to-day is comprised in the republics of Latvia and Esthonia.

The City-States

City Home-Rule. — During the Middle Age every town of any importance in western Europe had a government of its own which was at least semi-independent of all other governments. It levied taxes, enacted laws, administered justice, regulated commerce and industry, maintained an army or police-force, and in some instances declared war and concluded peace. As a rule, a town exercised the same kind of sovereign authority within its jurisdiction as did a great nobleman on his landed estates in the country.

Some Towns Subordinated. — Some towns were gradually subordinated to national monarchs and incorporated into National States. This was what happened to the towns in England, France, the Scandinavian countries, Poland, Hungary, Spain, and southern Italy. Such towns, however, ordinarily obtained from their royal masters a formal grant or confirmation of liberal privileges of local self-government and, in addition, the right to be represented in the national parliament.

Free City-States. — Other towns, particularly in central Europe, were relatively stronger and more independent; they were not incorporated into National States. They occupied strategic positions for commerce between the East and the West, and thereby they grew wealthy and populous; being located in the territories of the disintegrating Holy Roman Empire, they were enabled to profit from the special weakness of their theoretical

[1] See pp. 560–561

A Medieval City

Painting attributed to Hans Memling, a famous painter, born at Mainz about 1430 and died at Bruges in 1494. It suggests the medieval appearance of Bruges, then the most important commercial city of the Netherlands.

overlord, the Emperor. They thus remained or became practically free city-states.

These city-states of the Middle Age were to be found in Germany, the Netherlands, and northern Italy. They resembled the city-states of the ancient Phœnicians and Greeks. Each medieval city-state — Venice, Genoa, Pisa, Florence, Milan, Lübeck, Bremen, Hamburg, Danzig, Cologne, Bruges, Ghent, etc. — was a town with a certain amount of surrounding country and frequently with trading posts in distant regions. Each commanded the paramount patriotism of its citizens, so that a native of Florence or of Danzig always thought of himself as a Florentine or a Danziger and only incidentally as an Italian or a German, and each treated the citizens of the others as foreigners. Each had its own form of government, its own laws, its own courts, its own coinage and army (and navy). Each entered into alliances, waged wars, and negotiated treaties. Each was essentially a little sovereign state, as sovereign as any big state of the present day.

The history of most of the city-states is much the same. It is a story of external struggles between a city-state and its feudal suzerain for the assurance of its political independence, and between one city-state and another for the securing of commercial advantages. It is a story, likewise, of internal struggles between an upper class of nobles and wealthy merchants and a lower class of gildsmen and artisans, between "patricians" and "plebeians," for the control of the government and policy of the city-state.

Venice. — In Venice, one of the most famous of the medieval city-states, the wealthy merchants at an early date gained the upper hand and fashioned a government which long proved highly efficient. A Great Council, composed of the aristocratic Venetian families, chose the officials and enacted the general laws. A small Senate managed foreign and commercial affairs and made peace and war. A Council of Ten watched over public morals and ferreted out conspiracies; it had power of arrest and secret trial and could condemn anyone to death. A Doge, or Duke, was the elected head of the Venetian Republic, and, with the assistance of a Cabinet, he administered the government and commanded the army and navy. Venice grew very prosperous, especially as the



ITALY IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY

result of its naval and trading activities during the Crusades, and, like Athens of old, it built up a maritime empire. It acquired the larger islands in the eastern Mediterranean, such as Cyprus and Crete, and the whole of Dalmatia; it secured commercial posts and privileges alike in Moslem and Byzantine cities in eastern Europe and western Asia; and in token of its great sea-power its Doge annually performed an impressive ceremony of casting a golden ring into the Adriatic, indicating thereby that he was "marrying" Venice to the sea.

A Doge of Venice

Genoa. — Genoa was also a famous city-state in the Middle Age. Its internal history, stormier than that of Venice, was marked by fights between commoners and nobles, by feuds among the nobles, and by conflicts between Guelphs and Ghibellines; and only in the fourteenth century did it develop a fairly stable government under a Doge. Nevertheless, the Genoese during the Middle Age were almost as successful as the Venetians in expanding their foreign trade and establishing a maritime empire. As the result of protracted warfare with Pisa, another ambitious Italian city-state, Genoa acquired Corsica and Sardinia, and as the outcome of her efforts in the Crusades she too secured trading posts in the eastern Mediterranean. Subsequently a long contest between the Republics of Venice and Genoa led to the triumph of the former and the decline of the latter.

Florence. — Florence became a republic in the twelfth century. Its chief officials were consuls, and, though the nobles controlled the government part of the time, the common people were particularly independent and turbulent and succeeded by means of their well-organized craft gilds in making their influence felt more than was the case in Venice or Genoa. At times the government of Florence was almost a democracy. Eventually a few wealthy families became practically dictators or "bosses" of the Florentine democracy. One of these families — the great banking family of

the Medici (mĕd′ē-chē) — flourished in the fifteenth century and made its rule virtually hereditary. Florence adhered most of the time during the Middle Age to the Guelph cause and was a conspicuous member of the Lombard League; she conquered numerous neighboring towns and became the chief city and capital of that part of Italy which is known as Tuscany (ancient Etruria).



Senate Room in the Doge's Palace at Venice

Milan. — Milan played much the same rôle in Lombardy as Florence played in Tuscany. Milan, too, developed a semi-democratic government, and, being thoroughly Guelph in sympathy, she opposed bitterly the attempt of the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa to impose his government upon her. She was the leader and strongest supporter of the Lombard League and contributed materially to the Emperor's defeat in the battle of Legnano (1176).

In Milan, however, the hereditary rule of a noble family was inaugurated much earlier than in Florence. A famous archbishop of the city, a member of the proud Visconti (vēs-kōn′tē) family, obtained control of the government in 1262, and thenceforth until 1447 Milan was dominated by his relatives. In course of time the city-state of Milan was transformed into the duchy of Milan, and this became almost synonymous with Lombardy.

Other Cities. — Other cities of north Italy and of Germany and the Netherlands had similar histories of control, now by dukes or bishops, now by wealthy merchants, now by craft gilds, now by some democratic "boss" or aristocratic dictator. Some of these city-states rose to positions of great commercial prosperity and considerable military and naval strength.

The city of Bruges, for example, was to the Netherlands in the Middle Age what Venice was to Italy; and Ghent, which rivalled Bruges, was a sort of Genoa. Bruges and Ghent were in turn the chief cities and capitals of the duchy of Flanders, but no duke succeeded in impairing their liberties.

The German cities were likewise influential and even commanding in the affairs of the German Kingdom and Holy Roman Empire: charters from the Emperor and the princes guaranteed them local self-government, and the fact that their representatives constituted one of the three "colleges" in the Diet of the Empire gave them influence and prestige in the general government of Germany.

Leagues of Cities: The Hanse. — It was usual for medieval city-states to form leagues for commercial and military purposes. We have already noted the Lombard League, which was formed by a group of Italian cities in the twelfth century in order to resist the authority of the Emperor and to assure their political independence. In Germany, a group of cities under the leadership of Lübeck founded in the thirteenth century a league called the Hanse (hăns), or the Hanseatic (hăn′sē-ăt′ĭk) League, chiefly for the joint protection of the commerce of its members. The Hanseatic League, at the period of its greatest prosperity, comprised some seventy cities; it held periodic conferences, organized common military and naval expeditions, and undertook the promotion,

regulation, and defense of trade not only within Germany and among its own members but between Germany and foreign countries. The Hanse maintained trading posts in England, the Netherlands, Italy, Scandinavia, and Russia. The zenith of its power and influence was reached in the fourteenth century.

From Herrick's "History of Commerce"

A Hanseatic Ship

Experiments in Government. — Medieval city-states tried interesting experiments in government. They evolved at one time or another almost every kind of government which has ever been heard of — monarchy, republic, theocracy, oligarchy, plutocracy, and democracy. They tried, in one place or another, government by districts and by classes and by professions. They experienced "boss" government and "reform" government. Occasionally a "city-manager" was called in from the outside and paid a large salary to reform the government and to superintend the administration; in Italy there grew up a professional class of these city-managers who sold their services to the highest bidder. There also grew up, especially in Italy, a professional class of free-lance soldiers

EUROPEAN TRADE-ROU



30° 35° 40° 45° 50° 55° 60° 65° 70°
55° 50° 45° 40° 35° 30° 25°
URAL MTS.
Narva
Reval
Dorpat
Novgorod
Volga R.
Nijni Novgorod
Kazan
Moscow
Dünaburg
Düna R.
Kovno
Vitebsk
Smolensk
MUSCOVY
Volga R.
Ural R.
KIPCHAK
KHANATE OF
Saracanco
Sarai
OLD TRADE ROUTE BETWEEN SWEDEN AND CONSTANTINOPLE
Kiev
Dnieper R.
Dniester R.
Hil or Citracen (Astrakhan)
CUMANIA
Tana
CASPIAN SEA
Derbend
Caucasus Mts.
ZICHIA
Kaffa
Poti
Tiflis
BLACK SEA
Danube R.
BULGARIA
Bälkar Mts.
Constantinople
GREAT ARMENIA
Samsun
Trebizond
Sivas
TINE EMPIRE
Angora
ANATOLIA (ASIA MINOR)
Iconium
Taurus Mts.
LESSER ARMENIA
Tarsus
Edessa
Aleppo
Rakka
Euphrates
Tigris
KHANATE OF PERSIA
HAZAH
LURISTAN
Bagdad
IRAK
KHUZISTAN
Basra
TO INDIA
Persian Gulf
Seleucia
Antioch
RHODES
CYPRUS
Tripoli
SYRIA
Canea
CRETE
SEA
Beirut
Damascus
Acre
Jaffa
Jerusalem
Gaza
Damietta
Farama
Suez
Alexandria
Cairo
Akabah
Tebuk
ARABIA
Siwah
EGYPT
Nile R.
Red Sea
Wms. Eng. Co., N.Y.
itude East 25° from Greenwich 30° 35° 40° 45°

E MIDDLE AGE

whose captains, the so-called "condottieri" (kŏn′dŏt-tyâr′ē), hired them out to a given city; in this way a city-state might obtain an army without enlisting its own citizens. One of the most famous of the later condottieri was Francesco Sforza (frän-chĕs′cō sfôr′tsä), who was employed by Naples and then by Milan and who finally succeeded the Visconti as duke of Milan (1450).

Diplomacy. — It was among medieval city-states in Italy that many of the practices of modern diplomacy arose. Other states, ancient as well as medieval, had despatched special ambassadors to foreign countries in order to make some demand or to conclude a treaty; and the Popes had long been in the habit of entrusting distant negotiations to special envoys, styled legates. But Venice went a step farther in the thirteenth century by creating a professional class of diplomatists or ambassadors. The reports of the Venetian Ambassadors have been preserved and have supplied us with much valuable information about the Middle Age and early Modern Times. One curious Venetian rule of the thirteenth century forbade any ambassador to be accompanied abroad by his wife, lest she divulge his business, and required him to take his own cook, lest he be poisoned. In the development of a professional class of ambassadors, other city-states soon imitated the example of Venice, and so, too, in time did the monarchs of the rising National States.

The National States

Nature of National States. — In the tenth century — just prior to the beginning of the Middle Age — government throughout western Europe was almost wholly feudal and local. There were then, strictly speaking, no National States. In the fourteenth century — at the close of the Middle Age — feudalism and localism were still dominant in the Holy Roman Empire and city-states of Germany and Italy, but elsewhere National States were rising.

What do we mean by a National State? A National State is a common political organization of people who speak the same language. As soon as English-speaking people or French-speaking people or Polish-speaking people or Hungarian-speaking people possess a common government of their own, independent of all

foreign governments and superior to all local governments, they constitute a National State. This is what occurred during the latter part of the Middle Age.

Factors in Their Growth. — Several factors contributed to the rise of National States. (1) The development of a number of distinct languages created diverse nationalities and marked them off from one another and gradually stimulated in the members of each the feeling that they were different from all other nationalities and belonged together. We shall return to this subject in the next chapter. (2) The Church, while asserting its unity and universality, recognized the principle of nationality and furnished an example in this respect to lay rulers. It set up unified ecclesiastical governments, each under a "primate," in England, Spain, Poland, etc., before any of these countries had a truly unified political government. It encouraged the holding of national synods by the clergy in each country; and it adapted its missionary methods to the different needs of the several nationalities. Besides, the Church in its conflicts with the Holy Roman Empire and with feudalism frequently found an ally in some National State and therefore gave moral and material aid to it. (3) The tradition of separate political governments for the several nationalities, dating from the foundation of barbarian kingdoms on the ruins of the old Roman Empire, was kept alive and utilized by certain outstanding kings in order to enhance their national authority and prestige. The rise of National States would have been impossible without competent kingly leaders. (4) The revival, during the Middle Age, of the ancient Roman law stressed the supremacy of the monarch and hence ran counter to feudal law. (5) Most important, perhaps, were the actual circumstances and requirements of the time.

In the existing feudal society, as we have seen, private war between feudal lords was prevalent, and private war was most disturbing to anyone who wished to earn an honest, peaceful living. It was disquieting and destructive to the peasants in the country and especially so to the merchants and manufacturers in the towns (the middle class, or bourgeoisie). Neither the Holy Roman Empire nor a single city could repress the feudal lords or put a stop to private warfare. Hence, for economic and pacific reasons, the

"commoners" — bourgeoisie and peasantry — turned in most countries to their national king and assisted him in extending law and order throughout his national dominion. National States, under national kings, were the outcome. Let us trace the process in particular countries.

ENGLAND

William the Conqueror. — In the year 1066 the French-speaking Duke William of Normandy, with an expeditionary force of some



THE CROSSING OF WILLIAM'S EXPEDITION FROM NORMANDY TO ENGLAND
From the Bayeux Tapestry, which was embroidered probably by the wife of William the Conqueror and the ladies of her court.

5000 men and 2500 horses, crossed the English Channel in small open boats, defeated and killed the Saxon King Harold in the battle of Hastings, and had himself crowned King of England. This King William I (1066–1087) — William the Conqueror — was an extraordinary man. He ruled his French duchy of Normandy with an iron hand, and in England he established orderly government under his supreme authority. Manors and estates which his conquering army took away from Saxon noblemen, he proceeded to grant as fiefs to his principal Norman followers, but with the

provision that they should recognize the King as their suzerain and should not fight private wars with each other. He insisted that every Englishman owed taxes and military service directly to the King. In 1086 he compiled the famous "Domesday Book," a survey of what his subjects could and should pay him in the way of taxes; and in the same year he required certain landowners to take the "Oath of Salisbury," a solemn pledge "that they would be faithful to him against all other men," that is, even against their immediate feudal lords.

The Norman Monarchy. — Though William I and his immediate successors had some trouble with their Saxon subjects and a good deal of trouble with their Norman vassals, they strengthened royal authority and laid the foundations for a National State in England. It was gradually recognized that the King was supreme throughout the whole country in the making and enforcing of laws, in the management of foreign affairs, in the coining of money, and in the appointment of officials. The King was assisted in his government by several important officials, including a "Justiciar," who was his chief agent, and a "Chancellor," who prepared legal documents and acted as chief secretary; and he was advised by a "Great Council," comprising, as in Saxon days, the principal nobles and bishops and abbots of the realm. The "Curia Regis" (King's Court) was a committee of the Great Council, named by the King to administer justice. For local government the King appointed a sheriff in each shire (county), and likewise a coroner, one of whose minor duties was to inquire into sudden or violent deaths.

Henry II and the Church. — About a hundred years after the Norman Conquest a remarkable King appeared in the person of Henry II (1154–1189). As William I had sought to subject the nobility, so Henry II wished to subordinate the clergy to royal control. The clergy at this time were powerful in England, as on the Continent, and their judicial privileges especially rankled in the King's mind. In 1164 Henry II issued royal decrees, called the Constitutions of Clarendon, which ordered that clergymen who violated certain of the King's laws were to be tried in the royal courts as well as in the Church courts, that appeals to the Pope must not be made without the King's permission, that law-suits

about Church lands should be tried in the King's courts, and that no clergyman was to leave the country without the royal assent. Thomas à Becket, archbishop of Canterbury, denounced the Constitutions of Clarendon, and, supported by the Pope, carried on a bitter struggle with the King. The eventual assassination of the archbishop by servants of Henry II reacted against the King: Thomas was regarded as a martyr and saint by the English people; and Henry, to allay popular resentment, did penance and revoked the Constitutions of Clarendon. The English King might humble the nobility; not yet could he completely humble the clergy.

The Jurors. — Henry II was more successful with his other judicial reforms. In 1166, by the Assize of Clarendon (not to be confused with the Constitutions of Clarendon) he ordered that certain "jurors" — twelve men in every local district and four men in every village — should regularly report on oath to the sheriffs of the counties what crimes had been committed within their jurisdiction, and that the perpetrators of such crimes should be tried before royal judges who would go out from the Curia Regis and hold court in turn in the various county-seats. The Assize of Clarendon was an important step in the development of the English (and American) system of circuit judges and jury trials.

Magna Carta. — The next step in the development of national government in England was a reaction against excessive royal authority. A combination of the clergy, nobility, and middle class against the King resulted in a guarantee of their fundamental rights. This was Magna Carta, extorted from King John, the son of King Henry II, in 1215. John was arrogant, cruel, and thoroughly despicable. He overtaxed his subjects, and he quarreled with his vassals and simultaneously with the King of France and with the Pope. With so many enemies, he could make headway against none. He was compelled to acknowledge the Pope as feudal suzerain of England.[1] He was defeated in battle and despoiled of his possessions on the Continent by the French King. Confronted with rebellion at home, he sealed at Runnymede, close to his royal palace of Windsor, a great Charter which had

[1] See p. 567.



King John Signing Magna Carta
From a modern painting.

been drafted by a famous archbishop of Canterbury, Stephen Langton, and by a committee of noblemen.

This Great Charter (Magna Carta) was a lengthy document, setting forth in detail what the King might not do. By sealing it, the King promised: (1) to assure the freedom of the Church; (2) to respect the feudal rights and privileges of the nobility; (3) to uphold the charter of the city of London; (4) to levy certain taxes only with the consent of the Great Council; (5) to reform the administration of justice, so that certain accused persons would not be tried or punished more than once for the same offense, or be arrested and kept in prison without trial, and that all such persons would be tried within a reasonable time and by a jury of their equals; and (6) to allow the nobles to appoint a committee which would watch the King and punish him if he violated the Charter.

Beginning of Parliament. — John soon violated Magna Carta, and so did his son and successor, Henry III (1216–1272), with the result that the thirteenth century was marked by a series of civil wars and constitutional commotions in England. The most conspicuous leader in the movement to limit the power of the King was a nobleman, Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester (lĕs′tĕr).[1] Montfort fought Henry III, and, after taking him prisoner, convened (1265) a body consisting not only of bishops and abbots and great lay lords but also of two knights of each shire and two citizens from each city and borough. This body was called a Parliament.

Henry III was victorious in the end and overthrew Simon de Montfort, but Edward I (1272–1307), the able son and successor of Henry III, saw fit to abide by Magna Carta and in 1295 called a "Model Parliament," similar in organization to Montfort's Parliament of thirty years earlier. The year 1295 marks the real beginning of the English Parliament. In the reign of Edward II (1307–1327) Parliament became a regular, legal institution of English government, and in Parliament the shires and boroughs were regularly represented along with the clergy and nobility.

[1] He was born in France, the son of the leader of the Crusade against the Albigenses (see above, p. 570), but settled in England in 1230 and became thoroughly English.

In the fourteenth century under Edward III the clergy and nobility united to form the "House of Lords," and the knights (or country gentlemen) from the shires and the burgesses from the towns joined to constitute the "House of Commons." Parliament was thus a body which in theory represented the King, Lords, and Commons of the realm.

It grew in influence and asserted specific rights: (1) that its consent was necessary for the levying of new taxes; (2) that it could impeach and try royal officials; (3) that it could determine the royal succession; (4) that it was the sole judge of the qualifications of its members and that its members were exempt from arrest. England became, during the Middle Age, a constitutional limited monarchy. The King was powerful, but his powers were limited by feudal contracts and especially by the Lords and Commons in Parliament.

The English Language and the Nation. — The English monarchs from William I to Edward III were not heads of a single, united National State. In England itself, the lapse of two or three centuries was required for the conquering Normans and conquered Saxons to fuse into one people and form the English nation. For a long time the language of the Normans and of the upper classes was French, and that of the Saxons and lower classes was a German dialect. Gradually, however, Saxon German words and Norman French words were altered and fitted together and embodied in a common language — the English language, which we speak to-day. The rise of this English language heralded the rise of the English nationality and of the English National State. The fact that all people who spoke the English language were subject to one King, one law, one Parliament, and one national church organization promoted national union and national patriotism among them. England became, in the Middle Age, not only a limited monarchy but a National State.

Non-English Possessions. — At the same time it should be borne in mind that the Kings of England had non-English dominions. William the Conqueror was duke of Normandy and as such he was a vassal of the King of France and a ruler of French-speaking people; and some of his successors devoted more attention

INTERIOR OF WESTMINSTER ABBEY

Built in the Middle Age, it was the burial-place of English Kings and has become a national shrine for the English nation.

to their French possessions than to the National State of England. Henry II not only obtained England and Normandy by right of descent through his mother from William I, but he inherited the French county of Anjou (äN′zhōō′) from his father and acquired by marriage the extensive fief of Aquitaine (ăk′wĭ-tān′). Besides, he conquered the eastern part of Ireland and established his sway over Celtic-speaking Irishmen in the so-called "English Pale." Henry II possessed a veritable empire, including England, a section of Ireland, and more than half of France.

The French possessions of the Kings of England served to divert their ambitions and efforts from England and to provide many causes and occasions for protracted wars between them and their nominal feudal suzerains, the Kings of France. John lost Normandy and Anjou to the French King, but it was not until the final stages of the so-called Hundred Years' War (1337–1453) that English Kings ceased to be sovereigns in France and were thereby enabled to devote themselves wholly to the national interests of England.[1]

In the meantime the English Kings were seeking to extend their sway, outside of England, over other parts of the British Isles. Edward I subdued Wales, killed the native prince, and conferred upon his own son the honorary title of Prince of Wales (1301) — a title which has ever since been borne by the heir to the English throne. Edward I also claimed suzerainty over the Kingdom of Scotland; he defeated the Scots, deposed their King, and himself assumed the crown of Scotland (1296). The Scots, however, under a number of patriotic leaders, such as William Wallace and Robert Bruce, rose in arms; they routed the English at the battle of Bannockburn (1314) and assured the independence of their own country. Scotland continued to exist as a separate National State, with a King of its own until 1603, and with a Parliament of its own until 1707.

FRANCE

Weakness of Capetian Kings. — We have previously observed that in the partition of the Carolingian Empire by the Treaty of

[1] The Hundred Years' War is described later, see pp. 694–702.

Verdun (843),[1] one part, in which the French language was spoken, was called France, and that subsequently, in the year 987, a nobleman by the name of Hugh Capet was chosen King of this part. The descendants of Hugh Capet were Kings of France for centuries. At the outset monarchy was far weaker in France than in England.



PALACE OF THE CAPETIAN KINGS OF FRANCE

Situated on an island in the Seine at Paris. Almost exactly in the center of the picture is the "Sainte-Chapelle" ("Holy Chapel"), built by Louis IX (Saint Louis) and still standing as one of the architectural gems of the Paris of the Middle Age and of the present day.

France was really dominated by feudalism, and the King actually governed only the estates and manors of which he was the personal owner and direct overlord. These estates and manors were grouped about two cities — Paris and Orleans — and were called the "crown lands." The rest of France was divided into great fiefs — duchies, counties, etc. — whose lords in theory were vassals to the King but in practice were independent sovereigns

[1] See p. 494.

who flouted his authority. So far as the French people were concerned, most of them were loyal to their respective dukes and counts, rather than to the King, though some elements, notably the cities, the traders and travellers, the small free (allodial) landowners, and some of the peasants, were hostile to the turbulence and tyranny of feudal lords and naturally supported the King in his efforts to end private warfare and local exactions.

Louis VI. — Louis VI (1108–1137) began seriously the strengthening of the royal position in France by repressing disorder and brigandage on his crown lands and by supporting the cities and the Church in their disputes with his feudal vassals. By defeating the designs of the Emperor Henry V he saved France from becoming an appendage to the Holy Roman Empire and won popularity for himself as the champion of the national cause.

Philip Augustus. — Philip II (1180–1223), the grandson of Louis VI and commonly known as Philip Augustus, did much to strengthen the French monarchy. (1) He abolished royal homage for fiefs. Hitherto it had been customary for the King to do homage to nobles for lands he held from them, just as if he were a mere nobleman himself. Now, when the archbishop of Amiens (ȧ′myăɴ′) demanded royal homage for lands which he had granted to the King, Philip Augustus positively refused and successfully defied the archbishop. (2) He weakened the power and prestige of his greatest and most dangerous vassal, the King of England, who, as we have seen, held more than half of France — Normandy, Anjou, and Aquitaine. Philip Augustus was constantly intriguing against the sons of Henry II — King Richard and King John. On the refusal of the latter to do him homage for Normandy, he seized this duchy, and war ensued. Philip II won a decisive victory over John in the battle of Bouvines (bo̅o̅′vēn′, 1214) and definitely secured Normandy, and likewise Anjou, for the French monarchy. This victory broke the might of feudalism in northern and central France and established the supremacy of the royal power. (3) Philip II reformed the government of France, substituting royal agents for feudal officials. At the head of his government was a Royal Council, composed of chief officials appointed by himself. In the counties (or provinces) he appointed personal

representatives ("bailiffs" they were called in the north, and "seneschals" in the south) to collect taxes and administer justice. He also created an army, no longer a temporary feudal levy, but a more or less permanent royal force. Philip Augustus overcame feudalism with sword and diplomacy and royal law; after his time the French crown guaranteed internal peace and justice.

Louis IX. — Louis IX (1226–1270), the grandson of Philip II, was the model of the Christian King in the Middle Age. Religion involved for him not merely rules for private conduct but also guidance for his public government and policies. With Louis IX — who was recognized by the Church as Saint Louis — Christian morality permeated and dominated politics; he had but one end — to do justice to everyone. Under a great oak tree at Vincennes he sat day after day and administered justice in person, settling the disputes of townspeople, feudal lords, and kings. So great was his reputation for impartial justice that the quarrel in England between the King and the barons was submitted to Louis IX for arbitration. By his personal reputation and also by his wise legislation he made lasting contributions to the solidity of the French monarchy.

He declared the crown to be strictly hereditary. He developed the "Parlement" of Paris, a high court of justice, consisting of certain nobles, clergymen, and lawyers. He issued uniform laws and coinage for all France, and forbade the circulation of the coins of feudal lords beyond their respective domains. Two special measures he took to put an end to private warfare and to substitute royal justice. The first was a pledge of personal safety which he made to subjects who would lay their troubles and complaints before the King rather than before a feudal lord. The other was a decree that in forty days royal agents should do their utmost to effect a settlement.

The French monarchy in the time of Louis IX was strengthened internally, and it was also expanded territorially. As an outcome of the Crusade against the Albigenses, southern France was brought under the direct control of the crown, whose dominion now extended from the Netherlands (Flanders) to the Pyrenees.

Philip the Fair. — Philip IV (1285–1314), the grandson of Louis IX and nicknamed Philip the Fair, was a clever, unscrupulous

King, who relied upon lawyers even more than upon soldiers to gain his ends. Firmly resolved to complete the consolidation of the French National State under his own authority, he entered upon a political struggle with the Church and the Papacy, claiming the right to tax the clergy in France and to try French bishops in the royal courts. Pope Boniface VIII denounced these claims and threatened to excommunicate Philip IV and to depose him from the kingship.

The Estates General. — To secure popular sanction for his quarrel with Boniface VIII, Philip IV convoked in 1302 a kind of Parliament — the Estates General of France. The Estates General comprised three houses: the clergy; the nobility; and the commoners (or Third Estate), who "listened, received, approved, and did what the King ordered." The Estates General, even the French clergy, sympathized with the King rather than with the Pope; they wished to get rid of paying Rome taxes which they deemed exorbitant, and they felt the stirrings of a new national sentiment against a "foreign" Pope. They made the needful grants of money to the King and assured him of national support in his conflict with the Papacy. The Estates General of 1302 was the first of such national assemblies in France.

French Control of Papacy. — The next year Philip IV despatched an agent with an armed force to arrest Boniface VIII and bring him to France to be tried and deposed by a General Church Council. The agent stormed the Pope's palace at Anagni (ä-nän′yē), broke in, and found the aged Boniface lying in his bed, a cross clasped to his breast. An uprising of Italians freed the Pope from his captors, but he had suffered personal indignities and he died shortly afterwards. In 1305, a French friend of Philip IV was elected Pope, and the Papacy, temporarily removed from Rome to Avignon (à′vē′nyôn′), was for the next seventy years in the hands of Frenchmen and subservient to the wishes of the French Kings. The first of the French Popes coöperated with Philip IV in suppressing the Order of the Knights Templars and confiscating its property. Thereby the French King filled his treasury and established the financial independence of his state.

France a Nation. — The land subject to Hugh Capet back in 987 barely represented two of the modern departments of France.

Three centuries later, the land subject to Philip IV covered a space equal to sixty of the modern departments. Only four fiefs now impaired the political unity of all French-speaking people, and these fiefs, though large, were isolated: Flanders on the north, Brittany on the west, Burgundy on the east, and Guienne (gē′ĕn′) on the south. Like the fiefs, feudal institutions at large had been shattered, and a strong national government had been erected. The capital, which for long had been movable, was now established



THE LOUVRE IN THE TIME OF PHILIP AUGUSTUS

The palace of the Louvre was then a fortress of the French Kings. Most of it was torn down in the sixteenth century to make way for the much larger and more beautiful palace of the Louvre which now occupies an extensive site in the center of Paris. (See page 764.)

in the Louvre (lōō′vr′) at Paris. The French Kings were at last supreme in their National State of France. Yet France had still to pass through a great civil and international war — the Hundred Years' War (1337–1453) — before it could finally emerge with complete national unity and deep, widespread patriotism.[1]

OTHER NATIONAL STATES

France and England were not the only National States which came into existence during the Middle Age. Scotland, Hungary,

[1] See pp. 694–702.

and Poland became National States, and so did the Scandinavian countries of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden.[1] In the Spanish Peninsula arose the three National States of Portugal, Castile, and Aragon. The Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, in Italy, and the County of Flanders, in the Netherlands, at least gave some promise of becoming National States.

Scotland. — Scotland was transformed from a medley of quarrelsome Celtic (Gaelic) tribes, or clans, with a merely nominal "king," into something like a National State, under a truly national King, chiefly as the result of a protracted struggle against the Kings of England. The outstanding hero of this struggle was Robert Bruce, who won the decisive battle of Bannockburn (1314) and secured from England the recognition of the complete independence of Scotland. The daughter of Robert Bruce married an official styled the "Steward," and from this marriage sprang the famous family of Stewart (or Stuart) which held the Scottish kingship from 1371 to 1714. Scotland was not only an independent National State but, like England, a limited monarchy. The royal power was considerably restricted by a parliament, by charters (or "covenants") of personal liberties, by the privileged position of the clergy, and particularly by the feudal and clan influence of great nobles. Subsequently, the English language spread in Scotland, and Scotland was united with England.

Hungary. — Hungary was organized, as well as Christianized, by a notable King, Stephen I (997–1038), who received his crown from the Pope and is known in history as Saint Stephen.[2] He established counties as permanent administrative districts, and encouraged the economic and cultural development of his realm. Under his descendants, who continued to reign during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, feudalism made some headway and the royal power declined. A so-called Golden Bull, which the Hungarian nobles extorted from their King in 1222, resembled the Magna Carta which English barons had forced their King to sign in 1215. The Golden Bull assured the nobles freedom from arbitrary arrest and punishment, exemption from taxation, and the right to refuse military service except in strictly defensive wars.

[1] See p. 708. [2] See p. 514.

Poland. — Poland, though recognized as a "kingdom" in the year 1000, was long the prey of internal dissensions and foreign (especially German) invasions. It was not until the fourteenth century that Ladislaus I (lăd′ĭs-lȧs, 1306–1333) resumed the title of King, reunited the country, and by defeating the Teutonic Knights preserved the Polish people from subjection to Germans. His successor, Casimir III (kăs′ĭ-mēr), called Casimir the Great (1333–1370), introduced political and economic reforms and protected the cities and the peasants against the nobles. After 1386 the National State of Poland and the recently created National State of Lithuania had one and the same King, although each of the states kept its own institutions. In Poland, the power of the King was rapidly limited. The Pact of Kassa (1374) guaranteed to the Polish nobles the same rights as the Golden Bull had accorded to the Hungarian nobles; and a Parliament, comprising representatives of the clergy, the nobility, and the towns, came to exercise wide powers, including the election of the King.

Portugal, Castile, and Aragon. — In the Spanish Peninsula the Middle Age was characterized by frequent warfare between Christians and Moslems, and likewise by the rise of several independent kingdoms among the Christians. Eventually the Christian kingdoms overthrew the Caliphate of Cordova[1] and restricted Moslem rule to the little state of Granada, in southeastern Spain. Gradually, too, these Christian kingdoms coalesced into three — Portugal, Castile, and Aragon. The people of each spoke a dialect sufficiently different from the others to constitute in time a different nationality. The Portuguese, in the west, were included in the National State of Portugal; the Castilians (or Spaniards proper), in the center, formed the National State of Castile; the Catalans, in the east, were embraced in the National State of Aragon. Each had a king, a parliament (Cortes), and charters of personal liberty.

In Portugal, the title of King was assumed first by Alphonso III (1248–1279), and the Cortes, which met first in 1254, actually declared the crown elective in 1385. In Castile, Alphonso X (1252–1284) drafted a famous code of laws, and the national Cortes

[1] See p. 517.

came into existence in 1301. Aragon, if it had included all Catalan-speaking people, would have embraced southern France as well as eastern Spain. But southern France, as we have seen, was subjugated by the French Kings, and the Kings of Aragon were bent less on building a truly National State for all Catalans than on acquiring family possessions in Italy.

The Two Sicilies. — In Italy, we have already observed how the Normans established themselves and set up the kingdom of Sicily and Naples (Two Sicilies) in the eleventh century. This kingdom passed by marriage to the Hohenstaufen family, and we have noted how the Emperor Frederick II, crowned King of Sicily in 1198, tried to make it the nucleus of a united Italian State and how he failed to overcome the opposition of the Pope and the city-states.[1] In 1264 the Pope granted Sicily to the Count of Anjou, who conquered it with French troops, but with such cruelty that in 1282 the natives rose in revolt, massacred the French garrison, and through an assembly of their representatives offered the crown to the King of Aragon. Thenceforth for many years there was a family tie between Sicily and Aragon, which helps to explain why truly national interests were neglected by both.

Flanders and the Netherlands. — The Flemish people, too, had some national feeling, and their counts, who were vassals both of the Holy Roman Emperors and of the French Kings, occasionally fostered it. But the counts, in the long run, proved to be more zealous in the pursuit of personal ambitions than in the promotion of national interests. They became engrossed in the undertaking of distant crusades and in the erection of states in Syria and Greece. The result was that Flanders and the Netherlands remained a medley of feudal states and city-states and did not become a National State.

Most of Europe Nationalized. — From what has been said in this chapter, it should be clear that the political map of western Europe began in the Middle Age to take on the general appearance which it still has. By the fourteenth century, most of Europe was organized politically on a national basis. Only in Italy, Germany, and the Netherlands had localism triumphed in petty

[1] See pp. 512–513, 576–577.

principalities and independent city-states; elsewhere there were National States with national kings.

Limited Monarchy. — The kings of the Middle Age were not absolute. They were limited, strictly limited, by (1) survivals of feudalism, especially the abiding notion that their rule was based on a feudal contract between themselves and their subjects, (2) a fairly well-recognized right of popular rebellion against tyranny, (3) a frequent practice of election, (4) solemn guarantees of personal liberty, and (5) parliaments. In fact, the ideas of representative government, of trial by jury of one's peers (equals), of written charters or covenants safeguarding the rights of the people against arbitrary government, of the election of chief magistrates, and of the right of the people to rebel against injustice — these ideas are essentially medieval. Republicanism as well as monarchy, and the germs of democracy as well as of aristocracy, were associated with government in the Middle Age.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Mention the different kinds of government that existed during the Middle Age and give an illustration of each.
2. Explain the nature of feudalism as a method of government.
3. Define: "secular clergy"; "regular clergy"; "simony"; "celibacy"; "investiture"; "hierarchy."
4. What influence did the monks of Cluny have in reforming abuses in the Church?
5. Describe the conflict between Hildebrand and Henry IV.
6. Discuss the policies of Innocent III.
7. What was the Inquisition?
8. In what respects did the Holy Roman Empire of the Middle Age differ from the ancient Roman Empire (in the time, say, of Trajan)?
9. What was the nature of the contest between Frederick I and the Lombard League? Between the Guelphs and the Ghibellines?
10. To what extent did medieval cities enjoy home rule? What were the "free cities" in the Empire? What were the chief city-states in Italy? What forms of government were common in such cities?
11. What factors tended to promote the growth of National States in the Middle Age? Mention several such states.
12. Compare the reign of William I with that of Henry II and with that of Edward I as regards: territorial possessions; degree of national unity within the realm; extent of the royal power.

13. Discuss the significance of Magna Carta.

14. Describe the early development of the English Parliament. Compare the English Parliament with similar medieval institutions in France, Germany, and other European countries.

15. Summarize the achievements of the early Capetian Kings as regards the strengthening of the French national monarchy.

16. On the map indicate the chief differences between the political map of Europe in the fourteenth century and the map of Europe in the twentieth century.

17. For what reasons would it be incorrect to assert that absolute monarchy was characteristic of the Middle Age? What forms of government, or principles of government, were really characteristic of medieval Europe?

SPECIAL TOPICS

Nature and extent of the Empire. Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*, chs. xii, xiv.

Emperor Otto the Great. Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*, 80–85, 131–142; Cambridge Medieval History, III, 187–203.

Barbarossa and the Lombard Cities. Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*, ch. xi; Cambridge Medieval History, V, ch. xiii.

The city of Rome in the Middle Age. Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*, ch. xvi; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. lxxi.

Hildebrand's struggle with Henry IV. Munro, *Middle Ages*, 166–174; Flick, *Rise of the Mediæval Church*, 433–470; Foakes-Jackson, *Introduction to the History of Christianity*, ch. v; Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*, ch. x; Cambridge Medieval History, V, ch. ii; Robinson, *Readings*, I, ch. xiii.

The Church under Innocent III. Thorndike, *Medieval Europe*, 434–472; Flick, *Rise of the Mediæval Church*, ch. xxii.

St. Francis of Assisi. Robinson, *Readings*, I, 387–395; Taylor, *Mediæval Mind*, I, 415–441.

The friars. Flick, *Rise of the Mediæval Church*, ch. xxi; Jessop, *Coming of the Friars*, ch. i.

The monks. Gasquet, *English Monastic Life*, chs. vi, vii, xi; Cambridge Medieval History, V, ch. xx.

France under the early Capetians. Munro, *Middle Ages*, 175–192; G. B. Adams, *Growth of the French Nation*, ch. vi; Robinson, *Readings*, I, ch. x; Cambridge Medieval History, III, ch. v.

England before the Norman Conquest. Munro, *Middle Ages*, 193–203; Cheyney, *Short History of England*, chs. iv–vi.

Magna Carta. Robinson, *Readings*, I, 231–238; Cross, *History of England*, 139–145; Beard, *English Historians*, ch. v.

Origins of Parliament. CHEYNEY, *Short History of England*, ch. ix; WHITE AND NOTESTEIN, *Source Problems*, 73–106; BEARD, *English Historians*, chs. vi–vii.

Origin of the jury system. WHITE AND NOTESTEIN, *Source Problems*, 35–69.

Norman England. CHEYNEY, *Short History of England*, ch. vii.

Hanseatic League. KNIGHT, *Economic History*, I, 211–215; HENDERSON, *Short History of Germany*, 181–202.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THE TEACHER

CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY, III, V. W. A. DUNNING, *History of Political Theories, Ancient and Mediæval.* J. BRYCE, *The Holy Roman Empire.* A. C. FLICK, *Rise of the Mediæval Church.* J. F. FOAKES-JACKSON, *Introduction to the History of Christianity.* H. K. MANN, *Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages* (13 vols.). H. C. LEA, *History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages* (3 vols.). E. VACANDARD, *The Inquisition.* FATHER CUTHBERT, *Life of St. Francis of Assisi.* BEDE JARRETT, *Life of St. Dominic.* J. ABRAHAMS, *Jewish Life in the Middle Ages.* P. VILLARI, *Mediæval Italy from Charlemagne to Henry VII.* H. B. COTTERILL, *Medieval Italy.* H. F. BROWN, *Life on the Lagoons.* W. C. HAZLITT, *History of the Venetian Republic.* G. F. YOUNG, *The Medici.* E. P. CHEYNEY, *Short History of England.* A. L. CROSS, *History of England.* W. T. LAPRADE, *British History.* G. B. ADAMS, *Growth of the French Nation.* W. S. DAVIS, *History of France.* R. B. MERRIMAN, *Rise of the Spanish Empire*, I.

CONVENIENT SOURCE MATERIALS

J. H. ROBINSON, *Readings in European History*, I. O. J. THATCHER AND E. H. MCNEAL, *Source Book for Medieval History.* R. T. DAVIES, *Documents Illustrating the History of Civilization in Medieval England*, chs. ii, iii. E. F. HENDERSON, *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages.* G. B. ADAMS AND H. M. STEPHENS, *Select Documents of English Constitutional History.* G. C. LEE, *Source Book of English History.*

CHAPTER XVIII

CULTURE IN THE MIDDLE AGE

Languages and Literatures

All educated persons in western and central Europe in the Middle Age knew not only the spoken language or dialect of their respective localities but also the great literary language of Latin.

Latin an International Language. — Latin was not a "dead" language in the Middle Age; it was very much alive, and everyone who aspired to be a priest or monk, a teacher or a member of any other learned profession — law, medicine, etc. — or a cultured gentleman, learned Latin. He really learned it; he did not merely work out a few sentences in Cæsar, like a puzzle, with the aid of a dictionary; he learned to speak it fluently and to converse in it. Latin was the official language of the Catholic Church, and as such it was spoken and read and written by all clergymen. Of course the Latin written and spoken in the Middle Age differed somewhat from the Latin of ancient classical times, just as twentieth-century English differs from sixteenth-century English. But fundamentally it was the same language and it was truly international.

Medieval Latin Literature. — The bulk of writing done during the Middle Age was done in Latin, because Latin was the language of scholars and because writings in Latin could be read widely all over western Europe. Latin produced a great literature in the Middle Age as well as in antiquity. Latin literature in the Middle Age was of many kinds. Some of the classics of pagan antiquity, notably the works of Virgil, were highly prized. The Latin liturgy of the Church and the Latin version of the Bible — the Vulgate of Jerome — were heritages of previous centuries.

But apart from what was preserved from earlier times, the Middle Age itself produced much Latin literature — learned

treatises on theology and philosophy, commentaries on the Bible and on law, scientific works on astronomy, physics, and medicine, historical compilations, curious encyclopedias, informing letters, and beautiful hymns. We shall have occasion later in this chapter to mention some of the famous medieval Latin writers on theology, philosophy, and science.

Law. — Here we may point out that there was a vast amount of legal writing, including not only Gratian's code of canon law [1] and various adaptations of the Roman law of Justinian, but innumerable decrees issued by Popes and lay rulers in Latin and commented upon by lawyers and officials in the same language.

History. — Likewise there was a vast amount of historical writing: almost every monastery had its chronicler or annalist; almost every saint and statesman had his biographer; and ever so many medieval scholars attempted to write in Latin general histories of the then known world. Two of the most famous Latin historians of the Middle Age were Suger (sü′zhā′, 1081–1151), abbot of the monastery of Saint Denis near Paris and chief adviser to the French Kings of his time, who wrote a narrative of his monastery and important histories of the reigns of Louis VI and Louis VII; and Otto of Freising (frī′zĭng, 1114–1158), a German bishop and member of the reigning family in the Holy Roman Empire, who wrote a "world history" and a justly celebrated biography of the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa.

Latin Hymns. — Among the multitude of Latin sacred hymns which were composed in the Middle Age should be mentioned the "Dies Iræ" ("That day of wrath, that dreadful day"), by Thomas of Celano (chā-lä′nō), the companion and biographer of Saint Francis of Assisi; the "Stabat Mater" by another Franciscan monk, who was a contemporary and critic of Pope Boniface VIII; the majestic hymns of Thomas Aquinas (*ȧ*-kwī′n*ȧ*s, 1227–1274), including the "Tantum ergo" and "O Salutaris Hostia," which are still sung in every Catholic church in the world; and the devotional hymns of Bernard of Clairvaux (klĕr′vō′, 1090–1153), which have been translated into almost every modern language and are admired and loved by all kinds of Christians nowadays — "Jesus,

[1] See p. 561, note.

the very thought of Thee," "Jesus, Thou joy of loving hearts," etc. It is worth remembering that these Latin hymns, unlike the Latin poetry of ancient times, were rhymed, and that our practice of rhyming poetry was developed in the Middle Age.

Latin Translations of Greek Classics. — Latin literature was reenforced by the translation into it of Greek and Arabic masterpieces. A few medieval scholars acquired a knowledge of Greek, usually through contact with the Byzantine Empire at Constantinople, and others gained some acquaintance with Arabic from contact with Moslems and Jews in Spain. It is not without interest that the great works of the ancient Greek philosopher Aristotle were made available to educated people in Western Europe during the Middle Age, in part by direct translation from the original Greek, and in part by indirect translation from Arabic translations. It was not till the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, however, that the pursuit of Greek studies became a passion with scholars and literary folk in central and western Europe. But by that time Latin was declining before the rising "vernacular" languages and literatures.

Vernacular Tongues. — The "vernaculars" were the local dialects or languages spoken by the common people. During the Middle Age there was a bewildering hodge-podge of such local tongues. It may be useful to give a list of the more important ones.

(1) In southern Europe, emerged the *Romance* or *Romanic* languages: (*a*) Italian, in Italy; (*b*) French, in northern France; (*c*) Provençal, in southern France, and its twin sister, Catalan, in eastern Spain; (*d*) Castilian, in central Spain; (*e*) Portuguese, in Portugal; and (*f*) Rumanian, in Rumania. These languages developed from different spoken dialects of the Latin language.

(2) In northwestern Europe, *Teutonic* or *Germanic* languages were crystallized: (*a*) High German, in Germany; (*b*) Low German, with its variants of Dutch and Flemish in the Netherlands; and (*c*) Scandinavian, with its subdivisions of Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish. In England arose a new language — English — curiously compounded of Teutonic and Romance.

(3) In east-central Europe, *Slavic* languages assumed form: (*a*) Russian, in Kiev and Moscow; (*b*) Polish, in Poland: (*c*) Czech,

in Bohemia; (*d*) Yugoslav, in Serbia and Croatia, and its near relative, Bulgarian, in Bulgaria; and (*e*) Lithuanian.

(4) In the extreme west, *Celtic* languages survived: (*a*) Gaelic, in Ireland and Scotland; and (*b*) Welsh, in Wales, and its close relative, Breton, in the Duchy of Brittany.

All these four groups of languages — Celtic, Slavic, Teutonic, and Romance — together with Greek, were Aryan or Indo-European languages; that is, they belonged to the general family of languages to which the name Aryan has been given.[1] In addition, however, another general family of languages — the Turanian[2] — was represented in Europe by Magyar (Hungarian) and Finnish.

But such a list is too simple. It does not tell the whole story. Actually, there were almost as many local varieties (dialects) of English, French, German, Italian, and all the other languages named above, as there were counties and cities in medieval Europe. The Italian spoken at Florence differed widely from the Italian spoken in Sicily. The German spoken in Saxony was different from the German spoken in Cologne or Munich, and these were different from the German spoken at Hamburg or Danzig. Norman French differed from Parisian French. And English varied from Yorkshire to Oxford, from London to Wessex.

In many regions it was long doubtful whether the popular speech was a distinct language or only a dialect. For example, were Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish mere dialects of a common Scandinavian language, or were they distinct languages each with dialects of its own? Again, were Dutch and Flemish essentially one? And then, too, consider the perplexing situation in France and Spain: perhaps the greater number of the inhabitants of the former spoke French, and the majority of the latter spoke Castilian; yet, in southern France, in the counties of Toulouse and Provence (prō′väns′), the people spoke Provençal (prō′vän′sȧl′), while in eastern Spain, in the lands of Catalonia and Aragon, the people spoke Catalan. Provençal and Catalan were so like that they might be treated as mere dialects of the same language; yet in time the French treated Provençal as a French dialect, while the Castilians treated Catalan as a Spanish dialect.

[1] See pp. 105–106. [2] See p. 455.

Vernacular Writings. — At first the vernaculars were scorned as the common local speech of such vulgar persons as serfs and artisans, and were seldom used for writing. Gradually, however, writings began to appear in them. For example, clergymen, while clinging to the use of Latin in public worship and in official church business, sought to increase the devotion of the laity by preaching and teaching in the several vernaculars; and priests and

LORD AND LADY IN A GARDEN
Decoration on an old manuscript of medieval French literature.

monks were conspicuous among the early writers in vernacular languages. Kings and other lay rulers likewise began to issue laws and to compile codes in the language spoken by most of their subjects. The great compilation of laws prepared by Alphonso X, King of Castile, in the thirteenth century, was made in Castilian rather than in Latin, and legal codes for Saxony and Swabia were issued in the same century in German.

Poetry. — The vernacular writings for popular entertainment included poems, plays, stories, and histories. Of the poems there were two kinds — light lyrics about flowers and girls and love, and

heroic epics about chivalric deeds and mortal combats. Among the medieval lyrics which have come down to us, those of the Provençal troubadours (trōō′bȧ-dōōrz) and the German minnesingers (mĭn′ē-sĭng′ērz) are the earliest and the most famous. The troubadours of southern France were particularly famous in the eleventh and twelfth centuries; they wandered far and wide, composing and singing their songs, to the accompaniment of the lute, in lords' castles and peasants' villages and market places of towns. In Germany, the most celebrated minnesinger was Walter von der Vogelweide (fŏn dĕr fō′gĕl-vī′dȧ, 1170–1230), who wrote delightful songs of courtly love and homely love, of religious faith and patriotism. Among the host of medieval epics were the "chansons de geste" in French, including the "Song of Roland"; the sagas in the Scandinavian languages; the "Cid" in Castilian; and the "Nibelungenlied" in German. These epics, like the lyrics, were sung or recited from manuscript or from memory by professional entertainers, called "jongleurs" (zhôn′glûrz′) in France and "meistersingers" (mīs′tĕr-sĭng′ērz) in Germany.

Romances. — Sometimes entertainers would tell stories in alternating song and recitation, and because the earliest of such stories were composed in a vernacular language derived from Roman speech, they were termed "romances." A very beautiful romance of the Middle Age was "Aucassin and Nicolette," written in French in the thirteenth century. It should be read by everyone, for it gives a good idea of an important and interesting type of medieval literature.

Plays. — The plays which were written in the Middle Age were chiefly religious in character and purpose and were often produced in churches. They included mystery-plays, dealing with stories from the Bible or from Church history; miracle-plays, treating of acts, real or imaginary, in the lives of the saints; and morality-plays, affording moral instruction.

Rise of the French Language. — As plays and romances and poems (and laws and sermons) began to be written and known in this or that dialect, they served to exalt the speech of a particular locality and to render it a popular literary language for a fairly extensive area. In this way the troubadours developed Provençal

as a literary language in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and the jongleurs created a literary French. Because the word for "yes" in French was "oui" (wē) and in Provençal was "oc" (ŏk), the former language was called the "langue d'oui" and the latter the "langue d'oc." In the thirteenth century, as an outcome of the crusade of French-speaking Catholics against Albigensian heretics in southern France, the "langue d'oc" declined and the "langue d'oui" became the literary language for the whole country of France. In the "langue d'oui," that is, in French, were written not only epics, such as the "Song of Roland," and romances, like "Aucassin and Nicolette," and curious love-poems, like the "Tale of the Rose," but also valuable histories, such as the history of one of the Crusades by Villehardouin (vēl′ȧr′dwăɴ′, 1150–1212), the fascinating biography of King Louis IX by Joinville (zhwăɴ′-vēl′, 1224–1317), and the chronicle by Froissart (frwä′sär′, 1337–1410), which has delighted boys from his time to our own.

Dante, Father of Italian Literature. — In the meantime the Italian dialect of Florence and Tuscany was developing as literary Italian. Francis of Assisi, the founder of the Franciscan friars, lived a life of poetry as well as of religion; he was a sort of religious jongleur; and he wrote and sang his lovely "Canticle of the Sun" in Tuscan Italian. But the great Tuscan, the great Florentine, who established for all time the literary usage of Italian, was Dante (dän′tā, 1265–1321). Dante wrote some of his learned works in Latin, but the works by which he is best known and for which he is most loved were written in Italian — his beautiful poems to Beatrice and above all his immortal "Divine Comedy," which enshrines much of the art and thought of the Middle Age. Dante was the father and master of Italian literature. And close after Dante came two other great Italian writers — Petrarch (pē′trärk, 1304–1374), with his polished sonnets, and Boccaccio (bŏk-kä′chō, 1313–1375), with his picturesque tales.

Other Languages Become Literary. — Portuguese and Castilian likewise became popular vehicles of literary expression; and in course of time Castilian supplanted Catalan as the dominant literary language throughout the land which to-day we call Spain. In like manner the Low German language (Dutch or Flemish)

A Page from an Illuminated Manuscript

All books were written by hand in Ancient Times and during the Middle Age. During the Middle Age many hand-written (or manuscript) books were "illuminated," that is, they were beautifully illustrated with pictures and other decorations hand-drawn and hand-colored.

On the other side is reproduced a particularly interesting example of a medieval illuminated manuscript. It is a page from a fifteenth-century manuscript of a story (a romance) written originally in the thirteenth century and known as *The Romance of the Violet*. It should be noted that it is written not in Latin (the language of medieval scholars) but in French (then one of the rising vernacular languages).

The King, who in the picture stands with his Queen at the right of a double line of courtiers, is supposed to be King Louis VI of France (1108–1137), though he and all the others are dressed in costumes of the fifteenth, rather than of the twelfth, century.

Ly commence de girart conte de Neuers / Et de la grant court que tinst le roy loys le gros.

Pour le temps que lon con toit / lan de lincarnation de nre sr. ihucrist / mil. cent z dix. Regna en france le tresuertueux roy nōme loys le gros qui en son temps eust moult daffaires alencontre de plu seurs princes / et autres rebelles de son royaume / Lesquelz par pluseurs ba

was marked off from High German (in Germany proper), and both became literary. And so, too, with the Scandinavian languages, with the Slavic languages, and with Magyar.

English Literature. — English, being a hybrid of Norman French and Saxon German, developed a vernacular literature and thereby became fixed somewhat later than Italian and other Continental languages. The earliest significant examples of a distinctive English literature are the "Canterbury Tales," by Chaucer (chô′sẽr, 1340–1400), the quaint moralizings of "Piers the Plowman," written by an unknown author in the fourteenth century, the romances of King Arthur and his legendary court written in the fifteenth century by Sir Thomas Malory (măl′ŏ-rĭ), and some carols and popular ballads, notably the "Nut Brown Maid."

Summary. — At the beginning of the Middle Age — say, about the year 1000 — almost all literature in central and western Europe was Latin. At the close of the Age — say, about 1400 — most learned writing was still done in Latin, but there had already emerged distinctive popular literatures in Provençal, French, Italian, Castilian, German, English, and other vernaculars. A vast variety of local dialects were still spoken, but they were slowly being subordinated to national languages and national literatures.

All Books Handwritten. — It should be remembered that all medieval literature — Latin and vernacular alike — was written and copied by hand. There were no typewriters, and no printing presses. Copying was done mainly by monks and professional secretaries, and libraries were accumulated by monasteries, bishops, princes, and some well-to-do merchants. But it was an arduous task to copy a whole book by hand, and mistakes in copying were especially liable to occur. The result was that books were often defective and relatively scarce and expensive. Such an all-important book as the Bible, for example, could not be afforded by an ordinary layman. There could be no solution of such difficulties prior to the invention of printing; and printing was not employed in Europe until the fifteenth century, in the era of transition from the Middle Age to Modern Times.

Education

Popular Education. — The Middle Age was characterized by an important development of education. In home and in church everyone was taught religion. On the manor or in the town most young people were taught the means of earning a livelihood: the country boy learned farming from his relatives and associates, and the city boy learned a trade or craft from a master gildsman; and girls were instructed by their mothers in cooking and sewing and housekeeping. In these respects education in the Middle Age was not essentially different from what it had always been.

Schools Not Compulsory. — Attending school in the Middle Age was not compulsory or universal. A boy or girl did not have to go to school, did not have to learn to read and write, did not have to study arithmetic, geography, civics, grammar, or history. Schooling was regarded not as a right for all but as a privilege for some. The majority actually did not go to school.

Schools and Studies. — Schooling, though not compulsory, developed considerably during the Middle Age. Every bishop maintained a cathedral school and almost every monastery had a monastic school. The primary purpose of these schools was to train young men for the priesthood or for a special religious life, but the course of study included subjects other than religion. In fact, the basis of the curriculum of the numerous cathedral and monastic schools in the Middle Age was the study of the same "liberal arts" as had been taught in the schools of the ancient Roman Empire.

The "liberal arts" were seven in number: three, called the *Trivium*, consisted of grammar, dialectic, and rhetoric; the remaining four, called the *Quadrivium*, comprised geometry, arithmetic, music, and astronomy. The scope of each of the liberal arts was wider than its name might suggest. Under grammar was embraced the study of Latin language and literature. Dialectic was a stiff course in logic. Rhetoric covered the rudiments of law, as well as composition in prose and verse. Geometry included the study of Euclid and, in addition, what is now understood by geography and natural history. Arithmetic dealt

with Roman numbers and with the calculation of the calendar. Music embraced the rules of the plain-song (or Gregorian chant) of the Church, some theory of sound, and the study of harmony. Astronomy dealt with the courses of the heavenly bodies, and likewise with some rude conceptions of physics and chemistry. All these subjects were taught from textbooks, most of which had been composed in ancient Roman times and preserved during the Dark Age; textbooks on the seven liberal arts were widely used and highly prized in the Middle Age.[1]

Elementary Schools. — In addition to the cathedral and monastic schools — the so-called grammar schools — many special elementary schools were established and supported by town gilds and feudal lords, to give instruction in reading and writing or in singing; and in such elementary schools the teaching was usually in the vernacular rather than in Latin.

Besides, some girls received special education in schools attached to nunneries; and many girls, chiefly of the upper classes, learned reading, writing, and the keeping of accounts, as well as fine needlework, household duties and management, and such elementary surgery and medicine as served in cases of slight daily accidents and illnesses.

Then, too, special education was provided for young noblemen, with the aim of fitting them to be chivalrous knights, wise masters of men, and prudent managers of property: they were instructed in reading and writing and arithmetic, in the rules and customs of courtesy, in the knightly conception of honor, and in such courtly amusements as chess and playing the lute, singing, and making verses.

Opportunities for Poor Boys. — Even boys and girls in rural communities who did not attend any formal school were instructed orally by parish priests or neighboring monks in the doctrines and duties of their religion; while the pictures and statues with which the churches were adorned helped to give a general knowledge of Bible history and of stories of the saints. Many a medieval boy,

[1] The best known of the textbooks was written by Martianus Capella, a pagan Roman, early in the fifth century. Other famous textbooks were those of the Christians Cassiodorus (468–562) and Isidore of Seville (570–636).

poor but of promising mind, was singled out by his parish priest and privately tutored; and the large funds at the disposal of the Church made it possible for ambitious poor boys to continue their studies at monastic or cathedral schools and even at universities. It is an interesting fact about the Middle Age that "poor scholars" greatly outnumbered rich scholars and that some of the foremost writers, students, and statesmen, even Popes, began their careers as poor boys.

Increase of Education. — At the beginning of the Middle Age schools were few and the number of illiterates was very great. At the end of the Middle Age schools were numerous and a considerable percentage, though probably not a majority, of men and women could read and write. Of course, the clergy, as a class, remained the best educated: they conducted most of the schools; they shaped the thought of the time; and they produced the bulk of the scholarly writing. But it must not be imagined that schooling in the Middle Age was exclusively religious or ecclesiastical; an ever increasing number of persons were trained to be lawyers, physicians, and men of affairs, and in the education of priests considerable non-religious knowledge was included.

The Universities. — The finest flower of medieval education was the university. In ancient times there had been advanced schools of higher learning, more or less resembling colleges. But our modern colleges and universities, with their undergraduate and graduate schools, with their deans and degrees, with their peculiar usages, are the direct outgrowth of the universities which were first established during the Middle Age. Let us try to understand these medieval universities.

The intellectual activity of the eleventh century, evidenced in the work of the Cluny Benedictine monks and in the reform of the Papacy and the whole Church,[1] led to a great increase in the number of students attending the monastic and cathedral schools and at the same time gave an impetus to more thorough and comprehensive study than had been usual in the ordinary elementary or grammar school. Around famous teachers gathered crowds of students from every country. Peter Abelard (ăb′ĕ-lärd, 1079–

[1] See pp. 563–564.

1142), a native of Brittany, established a school on the site of the present University of Paris and attracted thousands of students by his brilliant lectures and debates. Abelard is famous not only for his teaching ability but also for his controversies with the theologians of the time, including Bernard of Clairvaux, and for the tragic story of the love between him and Heloïse (ā′lō′ēz′).

In the twelfth century the need for organizing large bodies of advanced teachers and students grew imperative and was met by the rise of universities. The earliest universities were created not by deliberate foundation of any particular ruler but by spontaneous action on the part of the persons directly concerned. Later,

A Class in the Law School of the University of Bologna
From sculpture of the fourteenth century.

the Popes took over the general direction of universities, granting charters to those already established in Italy, France, and England, and, with the coöperation of princely benefactors, chartering new universities in France and Italy, and likewise in Germany, Scotland, Spain, Scandinavia, the Netherlands, etc. Each of the early universities was a specialized school of higher learning. The University of Salerno (in Italy) was famed for its school of medicine; the University of Bologna was celebrated as the center of the revival of the Roman law and the codification of the canon law. But the greatest of the early medieval universities was Paris, the home of philosophy and theology; and it was Paris which furnished the model for most of the later medieval universities, including Oxford and Cambridge, Prague and Vienna.

The University a Gild. — The word "university" meant "gild," and the medieval university was essentially a gild of students (as

at Bologna) or a gild of professors (as at Paris). At Bologna the students made the rules and regulations, determined the curriculum, and hired and discharged the teachers. At Paris the teachers — called "masters" — ruled the university and constituted a masters' gild like any other craft gild.

The University of Paris. — The University of Paris, which may serve as an illustration of the more common type, comprised two parts. (1) The undergraduate School of Arts was simply an enlarged and improved cathedral school, giving the customary instruction in the seven liberal arts. It was presided over by an elected official called the Rector, and its students were divided, according to their place of birth, into groups called "nations." Each "nation" had a head (a proctor) of its own, a dormitory, a dining-hall, and a chapel, and special resident tutors, and such "nations" developed into "colleges" like those which still exist in the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. Students who satisfactorily completed the prescribed course of study in the seven liberal arts were given the degree of Bachelor of Arts, and such as went further and prepared themselves to teach the liberal arts might be awarded the degree of Master of Arts and thus become full members of the teaching gild. (2) The graduate Schools of Theology, Philosophy, Law, and Medicine were professional schools added to the School of Arts. Each was under a Dean and was attended by students who already had become Bachelors of Arts. A student who satisfactorily completed the course of study in one or another of these graduate schools received the appropriate degree of Master (or Doctor) of Theology, Philosophy, Law, or Medicine.

Large Attendance at Universities. — Multitudes of students attended the medieval universities. It has been stated that at one time as many as 50,000 were in attendance at Paris, and 10,000 at Oxford; and though these figures may be considerably exaggerated, it is certain that the percentage of the population of Western Europe that received some university education was fully as large in the Middle Age as it is in modern times. In the Middle Age, moreover, students passed freely and usually from one university to another, spending perhaps a year or two at Paris, a

year at Oxford, a year at Bologna, etc. All university men, whether they actually became priests or not, were called "clerks," that is, "clergymen," and as such they enjoyed certain privileges: they were exempt from state control and from the obligations of paying taxes and bearing arms, and they could be tried for offenses only in Church courts.

A "Clerk" (Student) of the University of Oxford
From an early manuscript of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales.*

Student Life. — The university students in the Middle Age lived a life of mingled hardship and gayety. Some were well-to-do and were supported in relative luxury by their parents or by their own wealth and were often attended by servants. Most of them, however, were poor and were maintained by church scholarships and part-time labor on their own account and in some cases by begging. Medieval students were early risers, for classes began shortly after daybreak. Class-rooms were rarely heated and often badly lighted, and there must have been much physical discomfort for both students and teachers. Few students could afford books (which, it will be recalled, were not cheaply printed but had to be copied in longhand at great expense), and consequently they had to gain their knowledge from listening to lectures by the teacher or from taking notes of his comments on the textbook which he possessed and read to them. All had to know Latin, for university teaching was exclusively in Latin. Sometimes class-room exercises were enlivened by formal debates ("disputations") between two professors or between professor and student or among the students themselves.

Many interesting customs grew up in connection with medieval university life. Gradually a distinctive costume — the academic cap and gown — was evolved for teachers and students. From an

early date "hazing" and various forms of "horseplay" were practised by older students on new students (freshmen).

Student entertainments — dances, plays, and parties — were fairly frequent. Athletics occupied no such prominent place then as they do nowadays, though many medieval students indulged in hunting and fencing and in playing ball, and there was much tramping. There was some gambling and carousing. And there have been preserved many student songs — in Latin and in vernacular languages — which are not particularly pious.

Summary. — The Middle Age witnessed an almost revolutionary development of elementary and grammar schools and a quite revolutionary rise of those great institutions of higher learning — the universities. Christian civilization, germinating through the preceding Dark Age, now burst into flower and fruit. Around the medieval universities gathered the intellectual leaders of Europe. At first the secular clergy, then the religious orders, especially the Dominican and Franciscan friars, and finally laymen, furnished scholars and teachers and students to the universities. And in the universities centered not only the improved study of the traditional liberal arts, but also the newer studies of theology, philosophy, and law, medicine, mathematics, and science. The medieval contributions to these studies we shall next suggest.

Theology, Philosophy, and Law

The "Queen of Sciences." — In the Middle Age, the subject of study most esteemed — the so-called "queen of the sciences" — was theology, the science of God and the Christian religion. One part of it dealt with the relation of Christian faith to human reason. Another concerned the authority and functions of the Church and its ministers. Still another involved the application of Christ's moral teachings to ever changing and developing social needs and customs.

Abelard's "Sic et Non." — On some of the foregoing topics Popes and Church Councils gave specific decisions, but on many more there were varying and even contradictory statements by honored Fathers of the Church, such as Augustine, Jerome,

Ambrose, etc. Peter Abelard (1079–1142), to whom we have already referred[1] as one of the originators of the University of Paris, shocked many thoughtful Christians of his day by publishing in a book called "*Sic et Non*" ("Yes and No"), an assemblage of apparently contradictory statements of Church Fathers on Christian doctrine.

THE CRUCIFIXION, BY FRA ANGELICO
Painted in 1294. Fra Angelico was a monk and one of the most celebrated painters of the Middle Age.

Peter Lombard's Sentences. — Among the first of the medieval theologians to attempt a solution of the problems presented by Abelard, was Peter Lombard (1100–1160), an Italian who was educated at Bologna and subsequently became in turn professor of theology at Paris and bishop of Paris. His most famous work was "Four Books of Sentences," written about 1145 and consisting of a systematic arrangement of quotations (sentences, or opinions) from Christian Fathers bearing on the nature of God and of Christ, on dogmas and morals, and on the sacraments of the Church. The work

[1] See pp. 618–619.

soon attained immense popularity, ultimately becoming the textbook in almost every theological school and giving rise to endless commentaries and imitations.

Doctrine of Seven Sacraments. — The most significant contribution of Peter Lombard's "Sentences" to theology was the crystallizing of the Catholic doctrine about the sacraments. It had always been recognized that there were "sacraments" in the Christian religion, but it was not until Peter Lombard's time that their nature was clearly defined. Now it was maintained that sacraments were "outward signs instituted by Christ to give grace" and that they were the means, and essentially the only means, of saving souls. The seven sacraments were: baptism, confirmation, penance, eucharist, extreme unction, holy orders, and matrimony.[1]

Scholasticism. — Peter Lombard and succeeding medieval theologians did their work mainly in connection with schools of

[1] The seven sacraments may be briefly described as follows: (1) *Baptism,* the pouring of water with the saying of certain words, cleansed the child from original sin and from all previous sins and made him a Christian, a child of God, and an heir of heaven. Baptism was ordinarily administered by a priest, but in case of necessity any one who had the use of reason might baptize. (2) *Confirmation,* conferred usually by a bishop upon young persons by the laying on of hands and the anointing with oil, gave them the Holy Ghost to render them strong and perfect Christians. (3) *Penance,* a particularly important sacrament, got rid of sins committed after baptism. To receive the sacrament of penance worthily it was necessary for the Christian (a) to examine his conscience, (b) to have sorrow for his sins, (c) to resolve never more to offend God, (d) to confess his mortal sins orally to a priest, (e) to be absolved by the priest, and (f) to perform the special penance which the priest might enjoin, such as to visit churches, to say prayers, or to give alms. (4) The *Eucharist* was the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the consecration of bread and wine by priest or bishop, its miraculous change ("transubstantiation") at his word into the very Body and Blood of Christ, and its reception by the faithful in communion. "Mass" was the word employed in English to denote the Church service in which the Lord's Supper, or Eucharist, was celebrated. The word was derived from the Latin words, "Ite, missa est" ("Go, it is completed"), said by the deacon at the close of the service. (5) *Extreme unction* was the priestly anointing of the Christian who was in immediate danger of death, in order to strengthen him for a speedy recovery or a happy death. (6) *Holy orders* involved the ceremonies by means of which a bishop ordained priests and other ministers of the Church and transmitted to them the power and grace to perform their sacred duties. (7) *Matrimony* was the sacrament by which man and woman united themselves in Christian marriage, which was held to be indissoluble by human authority.

theology at the rising universities, and the scientific method pursued by them in reaching their conclusions is therefore called "scholasticism," that is, the method of the "schools" or "schoolmen." To understand medieval scholasticism it is desirable at this point to turn from theology to philosophy, the subject with which theology was most closely associated during the Middle Age.

Philosophy. — Philosophy — speculation about things in general — had flourished among the pagan Greeks and Romans of antiquity, and, though it declined during the Dark Age, it revived under Christian auspices in the Middle Age.[1] Two main topics absorbed the interest of medieval philosophers.

Nominalism and Realism. — The first was the controversy in the eleventh and twelfth centuries about nominalism and realism. Realism was the notion that ideas have a more "real" existence than concrete things, that, for example, the word "chair" primarily indicates the eternal existence of an ideal chair of which all particular chairs are mere copies. Nominalism, on the other hand, held that "chair" is not an eternal idea but only a name to indicate a number of objects which have enough in common to be recognized as chairs.

The dispute between nominalists and realists raged for a century or more in the university schools of philosophy, and, though at first thought it might seem unimportant, it had far-reaching results. Realism represented a spiritual view of the world, while nominalism represented an anti-spiritual view. And the protracted controversy between realists and nominalists sharpened the wits of both and gave an impetus to the study of philosophy throughout the Middle Age.

Influence of Aristotle and Averroës. — The second absorbing interest of medieval philosophy was in Aristotle. Aristotle, it will be remembered, was a famous ancient Greek scholar who had lived

[1] The most celebrated of the books which exerted a direct influence upon medieval philosophy was the "Consolation of Philosophy" by Boethius (480–524), a Latin scholar and translator of Aristotle and the counsellor and later the victim of the Ostrogothic King Theodoric. We do not know with certainty whether Boethius was a Christian or a pagan.

in the fourth century before Christ and had left behind him writings on logic, natural history, politics, art, etc.[1] In western Europe, some remembrance of him was always retained, but most of his writings were lost or forgotten for centuries. However, his works were known and prized in the East and were communicated in due time by the Greek Christians to the Arab Moslems, among whom they were kept alive by a succession of philosophers, first at Damascus and Bagdad, and afterwards in Spain. Thence they were translated into Latin and found their way into the universities of France, Italy, and other countries of western Europe. With the Latin translation of Aristotle came translations of writings of Arab philosophers in Spain, notably Averroës (1126–1198). This Averroës (ȧ-vĕr′ō-ēz) had written extensively in explanation and praise of Aristotle, and although he was a professed Moslem himself he had not hesitated to suggest conflicts between his religion and the philosophy of Aristotle and to urge that philosophy should be divorced from theology, and reason from faith.

At first, many Christian scholars believed that the philosophy of Aristotle, based as it seemed to be on human reason, was in sharp conflict with the teaching of the Church, based as it was on religious faith. The ensuing controversy was a bit like the modern debate concerning the relations of science and religion. Some Christians — the so-called Averroists — went so far in their admiration of the authority of Aristotle as to reject Christianity. On the other hand, the Pope for a time forbade the study of Aristotle in certain universities, in Paris for instance.

Thomas Aquinas. — Many Christian scholars soon came to believe, nevertheless, that Aristotle and Christianity could be reconciled, and the foremost philosopher and theologian of the Middle Age set out to do it. This was Thomas Aquinas (1227–1274), an Italian by birth, who received his early education at the monastery of Monte Cassino and at the University of Naples, joined the Dominican Order, and at the age of thirty became a Doctor of Theology at Paris. His most important work, the "*Summa Theologiæ*" ("Sum-Total of Theology"), stands to this day as the greatest intellectual achievement of the Middle Age.

[1] See pp. 220–222

It is not merely an encyclopedia of theology, however; it is the most celebrated exposition of scholastic philosophy.

Scholasticism Defined. — We should now be in a position to appreciate what "scholasticism" really was. It was the method of studying philosophy and theology in vogue in the schools of western and central Europe during the Middle Age. It was best illustrated in the *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas. His method was always to state a proposition, to bring forward all possible objections to it, and then by severe logic to refute one objection after another. Essentially scholasticism was the use of logic and reason in order to deepen understanding of the Christian religion and of Christian morals.

THOMAS AQUINAS

Painting by Fra Angelico. Thomas is clothed in the garb of the Dominican Order.

Law-Schools. — Theology and philosophy were two great subjects of intellectual interest in the Middle Age, and next to them in interest and importance was the study of law. The University of Bologna was the original center of legal studies, but law-schools were soon established in connection with many other universities. Two kinds of law were taught in these schools — the Roman law and the canon law; and the academic degree conferred on graduates of law-schools was the degree of J.U.D. (that is, Doctor of *both* Laws), or LL.D. (that is, Doctor of *Laws*).

Canon Law. — Canon law, as we have already explained, is church law; and we have elsewhere pointed out that the great

code of canon law was compiled at Bologna in the twelfth century by a monk named Gratian.[1] Canon law was important; thousands of able young men were trained in it at Bologna and elsewhere; it was used in the numerous and powerful Church courts; and it had considerable influence on other kinds of law.

Germanic Law. — Roman law, as promulgated by ancient Roman Emperors and finally embodied in the great code of the Emperor Justinian,[2] had been largely superseded in western Europe during the Dark Age by tribal laws and customs of the Germans, Slavs, and other "barbarians." Under the influence of these primitive peoples and of their superstitions, curious legal practices had arisen which were at variance with the more orderly and civilized Roman law. For instance, it was customary to hold a criminal's kinsmen liable for his crime; to decide a dispute by "wager of battle," that is, by a duel, an actual fight between the parties to the dispute; and to determine the guilt or innocence of an accused person by requiring him to undergo an "ordeal," that is, to prove his innocence by his ability to walk on hot ploughshares or to put his hand in boiling water without burning himself.

Revival of Roman Law. — With the advance of civilization in the Middle Age, however, the study of Roman law revived, first in Italy (about the year 1100), and soon afterwards in other countries. The Roman law appealed to many people in the Middle Age. It was orderly and systematic. It contained broad and simple principles of justice. It provided for court settlement of all criminal and civil cases. It held that an accused person was innocent until he was proved guilty by actual witnesses before an official judge. Above all, it gave powerful support to kings and commoners who were seeking to get rid of private warfare and the disorder of feudal society. The principle of Roman law that the monarch is the supreme source of law was seized upon by medieval kings to increase their authority and to consolidate their possessions. The principle of the Roman law that property is private and sacred was utilized alike by princes and commoners in order to break down feudalism. The most important results of the

[1] See p. 561, note. [2] See pp. 358–362.

revival of Roman law were not fully apparent until the era of transition from the Middle Age to Modern Times, but it should be remembered that the revival took place in the Middle Age and that a large and influential class of professional lawyers and judges were trained at the medieval universities in the Roman as well as in the canon law.

English Common Law. — While Roman law was being revived on the continent of Europe, a different and peculiar kind of law was developing in England. This English common law was not based on a written code and a definite set of written principles, like the Roman law, but was unwritten and consisted of decisions by English judges expressing what they thought were commonly recognized customs. The English common law developed mainly from early Germanic law, but its development was influenced somewhat by both Roman and canon law. At the present time, Roman law is the basis of the legal system of Continental Europe, of South America, and of Louisiana, while law-school students in all the other states of the United States, as well as in Great Britain, study the common law.

Science

Handicaps of Science. — Natural science occupied no such pre-eminent position in the Middle Age as it occupies in our modern world. It was taught only incidentally in the grammar schools and universities, and there were no special scientific institutions or foundations.

Several things obstructed the advance of natural science. (1) One was the absorbing interest in theology and philosophy, which centered the attention of most medieval scholars upon the supernatural rather than upon the natural, upon God instead of upon nature, and upon the unseen world of ideas more than upon the world which we see and touch. (2) Another was the tendency of medieval scholars to derive their notions of science not from personal observation and experiment but from books. If the Bible was authority for theology and ethics, it was authority likewise for science. If Aristotle was authority for logic and philosophy then what he said about natural history must be true. Not all

medieval scholars took such a view, but most of them did, and consequently the mistaken or erroneous opinions of earlier writers exercised a commanding and retarding influence upon the development of science in the Middle Age. (3) A third obstacle to the advance of natural science in the Middle Age was the surviving prevalence of popular magic and superstition.

Superstition. — The mass of ancient Greeks and Romans had been superstitious, and the primitive Germans, Celts, Slavs, and other "barbarians" were particularly so; and when all these peoples became Christian, they did not and could not rid themselves of ideas and practices which strike us as being superstitious or magical but which were habitual with them. Many such practices and ideas persisted throughout the Middle Age among most Europeans, and they still persist among multitudes all over the world.

The notion that it is unlucky to do certain things, for instance to walk under a ladder or to carry an opened umbrella when it is not raining; the notion that it is unlucky to begin things on certain days; the notion that a "charm," — a jewel, a medal, a rabbit's foot, — possesses magical power of warding off evil; the notion that certain other articles are diabolical and bring bad luck to the owner or wearer; the notion that spells, incantations, etc., have real effects: all such notions are what we mean by popular superstitions, and they were not peculiar to the Middle Age.[1] In fact, many "superstitions" were frowned upon in the Middle Age by the Church. On the other hand, many medieval Christians found it extremely difficult to distinguish between religion and magic, between science and superstition.

Unscientific Beliefs. — At any rate, much passed for "science" in the Middle Age which to-day we would describe as ignorance. "Marvelous occult virtues were attributed to herbs and even to parts of animals, such as the blood of a fox or the liver of a vulture. Snakes, mice, and various nasty substances were highly prized for their supposed medicinal properties. Going to a medieval doctor was far worse than a session with a modern dentist, for he was likely to prescribe that the patient take whole, in a little wine or

[1] See pp. 55, 67, 81, 250.

water, 'the worms with many feet that are found between the trunk and bark of trees' . . ." An English doctor "prescribed this as a remedy for spots in the eye, but added the recommendation that the dose be accompanied by repetition of the Lord's Prayer. As for toothache, among the treatments for it listed in the medical work of a scholar from the Spanish Peninsula who became Pope, we find filling the cavity with the brain of a partridge or with the pulverized teeth of a dog, as well as the more sensible application of opium. The greatest virtues among terrestrial objects were attributed to gems, some of which, it was believed, could confer wisdom and eloquence, graciousness or success or riches upon their bearers, or even make them invisible."[1]

Scientific Progress. — Despite much ignorance and prejudice and despite many mistakes and misapprehensions, the Middle Age did witness considerable progress in natural science.

(1) *Debt to Greeks and Arabs.* — In the first place, medieval scholars learned almost everything which had hitherto been known about natural phenomena. They not only obtained the writings of Aristotle on natural history, but from contact with Moslems in Spain and with Greeks and Arabs in Sicily they acquired all the old lore about astronomy, mathematics, medicine, geography, etc. Much of this was erroneous, but in any event the medieval Christians got most of what the pagan Greeks and the Moslem Arabs had to give, and some of it was sound.

(2) *Alchemy and Astrology.* — Secondly, some studies which were learned from the ancients and which were not really scientific were gradually made into sciences. Such were astrology and alchemy. Astrology, as derived from the ancient Greeks, was the study of the stars and included the belief that the relative positions of the stars at a person's birth determined his temperament and influenced his career. Alchemy, as derived chiefly from the Arabs, was the study of metals and chemicals and included the beliefs that base metals could be transmuted into gold, that the course of human events could be controlled by precious stones, and that human life could be indefinitely extended by an "elixir of life."

[1] This quotation is from a distinguished historian of medieval magic, Professor Lynn Thorndike, *The History of Medieval Europe* (1917), p. 387.

Numerous medieval alchemists maintained laboratories and experimented with minerals, animals, and vegetables, with drugs and poisons and elixirs; and though many things which they did were unscientific or even downright silly, they contributed much of real value to our modern scientific knowledge. Indeed, modern chemistry is derived in unbroken succession from medieval alchemy. With astrology, it was similar. Some medieval astrologers were mere "quacks," gaining money by telling fortunes and catering in other ways to popular superstition; but many made new discoveries about the stars and contributed in the long run to the divorcing of truly scientific astronomy from pseudo-scientific astrology. From medieval astrology has grown our modern astronomy.

A Medieval Drug-Store
From an old wood-cut.

(3) *Increased Knowledge in Other Fields.* — Thirdly, in some branches of science medieval scholars actually increased the knowledge of previous ages and other peoples. This was the case with medicine and surgery. It was also the case with certain branches of physics, notably dynamics and optics. It was likewise the case with geography. Medieval Christians owed much in all these instances to the Moslem Arabs, but they added notable achievements of their own.

(4) *Beginnings of Scientific Method.* — Fourthly, several medieval scholars presented downright revolutionary ideas about the method and goal of science, insisting that you should base your scientific knowledge not on books but on observation and that you should use it for practical purposes of human betterment.

Adelard (ăd′ē-lärd) *of Bath,* an Englishman who lived early in the twelfth century and travelled extensively in Spain, Italy, North Africa, and Asia Minor, translated Euclid's Geometry into Latin and wrote a particularly interesting work which he entitled "Questions About Nature" and in which he maintained that reason and experiment are the best methods of reaching the truth.

From Traill's "Social England." Courtesy of Cassell, London, and Putnam's Sons, N. Y.

A Surgical Operation

A copy of a medieval drawing.

Roger Bacon, another Englishman, who lived in the thirteenth century and was a Franciscan friar and a professor at Oxford and at Paris, addressed to the Pope several large works in which he criticized the habit of relying upon Aristotle for all knowledge, emphasized the importance of purely experimental science, and declared that in time through the applications of science men would be able to fly, to ride in horseless carriages and in ships without oars or sails, and to build bridges without supporting piers. In Roger Bacon and Adelard of Bath and a goodly number of their contemporaries, the Middle Age foreshadowed the experimental and the applied science of modern times.

(5) *Science in the Universities.* — Fifthly, science became a subject of study in medieval universities. The University of Salerno grew up around the study of medicine, and other universities established schools of medicine. Astronomy was taught in every

university school of the liberal arts, and likewise mathematics and physics. Roger Bacon did his scientific work in connection with the universities of Oxford and Paris.

(6) *Inventions.* — Sixthly, in the field of applied science there were many new inventions and discoveries during the Middle Age.

Algebra was taken over from the Arabs and developed as a useful branch of higher mathematics, and with it came the so-called Arabic numerals. The earliest reference in western Europe to our modern system of numbering is contained in a book by Leonard of Pisa in the year 1202: "These are the figures of India — 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 — and by means of them and of the sign 0, which the Arabs call a cipher, any number can be written." Hitherto Christians had employed the clumsy Roman numerals; henceforth they used the simple Arabic numerals; and the change was almost as revolutionary as the later invention of printing.[1]

In architecture and building, too, there were significant inventions — beautiful inventions such as the Gothic architecture, of which we shall speak in the next section of the present chapter,[2] and also such highly useful inventions as chimney flues, lead plumbing, glass windows, pipe-organs, and mechanical clocks.

New dyes and industrial processes were discovered. Cotton paper commenced to be used.[3] The mariner's compass with magnetic needle was devised and employed.[4] Gunpowder, also, was a medieval discovery in Europe. Roger Bacon discussed the explosive character of a mixture of sulphur, saltpeter, and charcoal, and a generation after his death gunpowder began to be employed a little for guns. By 1350 factories for the manufacture of gunpowder were in existence in at least three German towns, and French and English books refer now and then to its use in warfare.[5]

Altogether, it may be said that if science was more backward in the Middle Age than in modern times, it was far more advanced in the Middle Age than in ancient times. Western Europe in the Middle Age paved the way in science as in many other respects for the culture and civilization of the modern world.

[1] See p. 519.
[2] See p. 637.
[3] See p. 779.
[4] See pp. 679, 719.
[5] See pp. 685–686.

Art

Christian Art. — Perhaps the most signal flowering of Christian civilization during the Middle Age was in the realm of art — in the making of beautiful things. The art of the early Christians had

The Cathedral and Leaning Tower of Pisa

The cathedral was begun in 1063 and completed in 1118. The tower was constructed as a baptistery, and insecure foundations caused it to sink down on one side, so that it is now truly a "leaning tower."

been mainly an adaptation and direct outgrowth of the art of the pagan Greeks and Romans, but the art of the medieval Christians was largely original and distinctive.

We have already spoken of one important kind of medieval art — the medieval literary productions in Latin and in the vernacular languages. Some of these writings rank among the masterpieces of the world's literature. Medieval art also found

expression in architecture, sculpture, painting, music, embroidery, tapestry, and various other forms.

Church Architecture. — The most impressive achievements were in the art of building, that is, in architecture. New and beautiful types of building were created, chiefly in the construction of churches. To the Christians of the Middle Age it seemed of

A Romanesque Church

The Church of San Apollinare in Classe, at Ravenna, dedicated in the year 549.

prime importance to erect the best and greatest buildings for the worship of God, the celebration of the sacraments, and the honor of the saints. And so every bishop built a cathedral, every community of monks built a monastic church or abbey, and many a priest built a parish church which vied with abbeys and cathedrals in size and beauty. In the building of cathedrals and other large churches, the clergy were backed wholeheartedly by all the people in the diocese, town, or parish. We know very few names

of the actual architects, but we do know that rich men gave money and poor men gave labor and that princes and craft gilds and town councils worked together for the building and beautifying of the vast medieval churches. These churches were built slowly, but with the utmost care and love. They were the outstanding and monumental expression of the religious faith of the Middle Age.

Romanesque Style. — Two chief types of architecture were employed in medieval church-building. One was the "Romanesque," so called because it was a development of ancient Roman architecture, just as the "Romance" languages were developments of the ancient Roman (Latin) language. The Romanesque developed in Italy and spread in the eleventh and twelfth centuries to Germany, Normandy, and England. It was not merely an imitation or a continuation of Roman architecture; in many respects it was varied and novel. The Romanesque churches of the Middle Age were usually in the form of a cross, with a long nave, short transepts, and a semicircular apse; their roofs were carried to a considerable height on thick side-walls and on interior columns or piers often several feet in diameter; the ceilings and doorways and small windows were fashioned by round arches; and surmounting domes were frequently employed. Some of the Romanesque churches were very large, and all of them gave an appearance of great massiveness and strength. Perhaps the most noteworthy example of Romanesque architecture is the cathedral at Pisa with its famous leaning tower.

Gothic Style. — The other type of medieval church-architecture was the "Gothic," which originated in France in the twelfth century and was soon imitated throughout western Europe. The Gothic differed radically from the Romanesque. It kept and emphasized the cruciform floor-plan, but it utilized pointed arches in place of round arches, did away with domes, and employed "flying buttresses." Flying buttresses were stone props extending in the form of arcs from lower side-supports to upper reaches of the building; they aided in holding up the heavy roof and enabled the architects to increase the height and at the same time to decrease the thickness of the interior walls and columns and piers and to

provide space for enormous stained-glass windows in front and back and along the sides. Thanks to the flying buttress and to the pointed arch, Gothic architecture gave the appearance of great height and grace instead of massiveness and strength. Among numerous exquisite examples of Gothic architecture may be mentioned the cathedrals of Amiens, Chartres, Paris, and Rheims, of Milan, Toledo, Cologne, and York, the Sainte-Chapelle of Louis IX in Paris, and Westminster Abbey in London.



A Gothic Church

The cathedral of Notre Dame (Our Lady) at Paris.

Church Interiors. — The medieval churches, especially the Gothic, were richly ornamented with sculpture and painting and tapestry and carved woodwork and stained glass, all intended to instruct the people in their religion and to inspire them to lift up their hearts in adoration and thanksgiving to God. For the daily sacrifice of the Mass there were the magnificent high altar and a series of special chapel-altars, all aglow with candles and rich cloths and flowers and with crucifixes and vessels of gold and silver. On either side of the high altar were the choir stalls of delicately carved wood and nearby the carved pulpit. Aloft in the nave

and transepts and likewise around the apse (choir) were large stained-glass windows, depicting in lovely colors scenes in the life of Christ, the Virgin Mary, and the saints; and over the main entrance was an immense "rose window," especially exquisite with its delicate tracery and design. Below the windows hung

GOTHIC STATUES

On the Cathedral of Strasbourg.

religious paintings and banners and tapestries. The interior of the church was itself a prayer, and the exterior was a perpetual invitation to prayer. Up and up, stone rose upon stone in slender rib and flying buttress and pointed arch to the great roof and the lofty towers. Outside the main entrance, in straight rows across the front of the church and in arched recesses around the doors, were innumerable statues expressing saintliness and devotion or

symbolizing some doctrine or mystery of Christianity. Large statues of saints and angels filled the many niches all about the building; and in out-of-the-way places on buttresses and along the eaves and on the towers were grouped grotesque stone representations of dwarfs and goblins, funny animals and grinning monsters, the gargoyles which perhaps typified evil spirits that could not enter the church and certainly attested the sense of humor with which medieval workmen were richly endowed.[1]

Other Uses of Gothic. — Gothic architecture developed in and for church-buildings, but it was adapted during the Middle Age to other uses. Varieties of it were employed in private residences, gild-houses, feudal castles, and palaces. And these buildings, too, were often decorated with sculpture, painting, and tapestry.

Sculpture. — Medieval sculpture was sometimes crude and sometimes very fine. Some of it was intentionally humorous, and much of it was allegorical. It most commonly dealt with religious and moral subjects, with the creation and the spiritual qualities of man, or with the various occupations of man.

Painting. — Painting reached its highest medieval development in the work of Giotto (jôt′tō, 1266–1337), an Italian contemporary of Dante. Giotto's painting is famous for its simplicity, for its light and clear coloring, and for the spiritual expression of its figures. His greatest paintings, which have been preserved to us, are his scenes from the life of Francis of Assisi.[2]

Other Forms of Art. — The Middle Age produced many other kinds of art. The decoration and "illumination" of manuscripts reached perfection.[3] Splendid vestments were made for the clergy, and gay and beautiful clothing for lords and ladies. Furniture and all manner of handicrafts were stamped with art. Every master craftsman was an artist as well as an artisan.

Music. — Music was advanced alike by the Church and by the troubadours. Guido (gwē′dō), a Benedictine monk of the eleventh century, inaugurated our system of musical notation and for the first six notes of the scale employed the first syllables of six lines

[1] See pictures on pp. 542, 548, 573, 595, 597, 638, and facing p. 580.
[2] See pictures on pp. 566, 623, 627.
[3] For an example of an illuminated manuscript, see p. 615.

of a Christian hymn in praise of John the Baptist — ut, re, mi, fa, sol, la. Pipe organs, similar to those of the ancient Greeks and Romans, were built and installed in medieval churches; and keyboards were added, first in the cathedral at Magdeburg at the close of the eleventh century, and pedals in the fourteenth century. The lute was improved upon by the troubadours and a special system of musical notation was invented for it. Much of the plainsong of the Catholic and Episcopal Churches of to-day and many of our folksongs are medieval in origin or form.



Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

MEDIEVAL MUSIC

A page from an antiphony (or hymnal) of the fourteenth century.

The Middle Age and Modern Civilization. — When we take into account all the contributions of the Middle Age to our modern world — music, architecture, literature, universities, law, medicine, as well as ideas and practices of government and society — we must conclude that the immediate foundations of the present civilization of Europe and America were laid in the era from the eleventh to the fourteenth century.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. In what language were most books written in Western Europe during the Middle Age? Mention the different kinds of literature produced in this language during the Middle Age.

2. What were the vernaculars? Give a list of the vernacular languages. Which of these languages were derived from Latin?

3. Discuss the rise of vernacular literatures in the Middle Age. Contrast the vernacular literatures with medieval Latin literature as regards the kinds of subjects dealt with.

4. What were the "liberal arts"?

5. Describe the organization of a medieval university. What subjects were taught in medieval universities? Mention six important medieval universities.

6. Contrast medieval and modern student life and studies.

7. For what reasons did Abelard become famous?

8. With what questions did medieval theologians deal? What was their method of argument? Why was theology considered the "Queen of Sciences"?

9. Discuss the influence of Aristotle and of Averroës on medieval philosophy.

10. What is meant by "scholasticism"?

11. What different kinds of law were studied in medieval universities?

12. Summarize the scientific progress made during the Middle Age. What were some of the obstacles to such progress?

13. Describe Gothic architecture, indicating its chief characteristics, and contrasting it with classical architecture.

14. Discuss the statement that "the immediate foundations of the present civilization of Europe and America were laid in the era from the eleventh to the fourteenth century."

SPECIAL TOPICS

Medieval poetry. THORNDIKE, *Medieval Europe*, 399–414.

Medieval cathedrals. THORNDIKE, *Medieval Europe*, 416–432; SALZMAN, *English Industries*, ch. ix.

Rise of schools and universities. HASKINS, *The Rise of Universities*, especially pp. 3–36; CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY, V, ch. xxii.

The medieval professor and what he taught. HASKINS, *Rise of Universities*, 37–78.

The medieval student. HASKINS, *Rise of Universities*, 79–126.

Books and libraries. HASKINS, *Renaissance of the Twelfth Century*, ch. iii.

Study of the classics in the middle age. TAYLOR, *Mediæval Mind*, II, ch. xx (difficult); HASKINS, *Renaissance of the Twelfth Century*, ch. iv.

Translations from Greek and Arabic. HASKINS, *Renaissance of the Twelfth Century*, ch. ix.

Medieval science. THORNDIKE, *History of Magic and Experimental Science*, II, 777–808; HASKINS, *Renaissance*, ch. x; WALSH, *The Thirteenth, Greatest of Centuries*, ch. iii; LIBBY, *History of Science*, ch. iv.

Abelard. THORNDIKE, *Medieval Europe*, 379–382; TAYLOR, *Mediæval Mind*, II, ch. xxv; ROBINSON, *Readings in European History*, I, 446–455.

Adelard of Bath. THORNDIKE, *History of Magic and Experimental Science*, II, 14–49.

Roger Bacon. THORNDIKE, *History of Magic and Experimental Science*, II, 616–687.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THE TEACHER

L. THORNDIKE, *Medieval Europe*. CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY, V. H. O. TAYLOR, *The Mediæval Mind* (2 vols.). M. DE WULF, *Philosophy and Civilization in the Middle Ages*. C. H. HASKINS, *The Renaissance of the 12th Century*. C. H. HASKINS, *Studies in the History of Mediæval Science*. L. THORNDIKE, *History of Magic and Experimental Science* (2 vols.). WALSH, *The Thirteenth, Greatest of Centuries*. H. RASHDALL, *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages* (2 vols.). C. H. HASKINS, *Rise of Universities*. R. S. RAIT, *Life in the Medieval University*. P. VINOGRADOFF, *Roman Law in Mediæval Europe*. G. C. CRUMP AND E. F. JACOB, *Legacy of the Middle Ages*. F. J. C. HEARNSHAW (ed.), *Mediæval Contributions to Modern Civilization*. C. H. GRANDGENT, *Dante*. P. CONWAY, *St. Thomas Aquinas*. H. A. GUERBER, *Legends of the Middle Ages*.

CONVENIENT SOURCE MATERIALS

J. H. ROBINSON, *Readings in European History*, I. A. O. NORTON, *Readings in the History of Education: Mediæval Universities*. R. F. SEYBOLT, *Manuale Scholarium, an Original Account of Life in the Mediæval University*. THE SONG OF ROLAND (trans. by L. BACON). AUCASSIN AND NICOLETTE (trans. by A. LANG). CHAUCER, *Canterbury Tales*. THE NIBELUNGENLIED.

PART VII

THE TRANSITION FROM MEDIEVAL TO MODERN CIVILIZATION

Introduction

The three and a half centuries that followed the Middle Age, that is to say, the three hundred and fifty years from 1400 to 1750 A.D., witnessed profound changes in government and civilization. Christian Europe had long been in contact with Islam, but now came into touch with the separated civilizations of India, China, and America, while at the same time it felt the influence, more strongly than before, of the ancient classical or Græco-Roman culture. In this contact with the civilizations of other continents and of past ages, medieval European civilization itself was influenced and modified. For the first time in history all the great continents were swept into the stream of world intercourse. Ancient and medieval, pagan and Christian, European, Asiatic, American, and African civilizations all were to have their effect on the making of a world-wide modern civilization. But modern civilization can hardly be said to have been formed before the eighteenth century. The period from 1400 to 1750, therefore, was not modern, nor was it medieval; it was an age of transition from the civilization of medieval Europe to modern world civilization. We have termed it the "Era of Transition." [1]

[1] In some books it has been called the Age of the Renaissance (Rebirth), but this term conveys a false impression by overemphasizing the revival of interest in the Græco-Roman classics. Civilization was not "reborn"; it was expanded and modified. See note on p. 754.

CHRISTENDOM AND ISLAM,



ABOUT 1200 A.D.

CHAPTER XIX

THE CRUSADES

Islam and the Seljuk Turks

Disunity of Islam. — We have already learned something about the origin and early organization of Islam. We have surveyed the rise of the mighty Arab Empire, with its semi-religious and semi-political head, or Caliph, first at Medina and then at Damascus. And we have seen how in the eighth and ninth centuries this Empire was revolutionized by its subject peoples and broken into three major Caliphates — those of Bagdad, Cordova, and Cairo — and into innumerable petty principalities.[1]

Islam remained a cultural unit, but its political unity was broken forever and its rival Caliphs denounced each other as heretics. (1) In Spain and Morocco the later Omayyad Caliphs were weak and unable to cope with feuds in their own family, with bitter conflicts between Berbers (Moors) and Arabs, and with the independent ambitions of local princes and nobles. In 1031 the last of the Omayyad Caliphs was deposed, the Caliphate of Cordova was ended, and the Moslem state in Spain and Morocco was transformed into a loose confederacy of quarrelsome chieftains, among whom the Sultan of Morocco gradually gained preëminence in Spain, and likewise in Algeria, Tunis, and Tripoli. (2) The Fatimite Caliphs at Cairo were stronger and managed to establish political as well as religious control of Egypt and even to extend their sway in the tenth century to Palestine and Syria. (3) On the other hand, the Abbasid Caliphs at Bagdad, though generally recognized by orthodox Moslems as being the rightful religious successors of the Prophet, became mere figureheads. Though theoretically subject to them, parts of their Empire — Persia,

[1] See pp. 515–518.

Mesopotamia, Arabia, etc. — were actually ruled by a number of "sultans" and "emirs."

The Seljuk Turks. — Such was the general situation throughout the Moslem world when, in the eleventh century, occurred an important "barbarian" invasion. A tribe of Turanian nomads — the Seljuk (sĕl-jōōk′) Turks — came out of the same wastes and deserts of Turkestan as had been the breeding-places of Huns and Hungarians (Magyars).[1] As the latter had recently assailed the Christian West, so now the Turks overran a large part of the Moslem East; and just as the Hungarians (Magyars) ended by accepting Christianity, so, at about the same time, the Turks began by adopting Islam.

These Seljuk Turks became Moslems at the beginning of the eleventh century; and, leaving their native Turkestan, they crossed the Oxus River and occupied the eastern provinces of Persia. Like all other nomads, they pillaged and plundered. They defeated the Persians in 1040 and erected an independent state of their own with Merv as its capital. Thence they proceeded to capture Bagdad and the Abbasid Caliph, to subjugate Mespotamia and Armenia, and to invade Asia Minor and Syria. Against the Christian Byzantine Emperor they won a decisive victory in the battle of Manzikert (măn′zĭ-kĕrt, 1071), took him prisoner, and appropriated the greater part of Asia Minor. They captured Antioch in 1084 and almost completely destroyed Christian rule in Asia. Simultaneously they waged war in Syria and Palestine with the forces of the Fatimite Caliph. Wherever they went, they asserted the spiritual supremacy of the Abbasid Caliph, with themselves as political and military masters.

Before their conquests were complete, the Seljuk Turks displayed two tendencies which many other nomadic invaders and conquerors have shown. In the first place, they quickly adopted a settled mode of life and assumed the customs and manners and culture of the conquered peoples. Within a century they were an integral part of the world of Islam and were communicating Moslem and Arab civilization to the former Greek population of Asia Minor. In the second place, they could not hold together

[1] See pp. 454–458, 513–514.

and construct a solid, unified state: their extensive conquests were speedily partitioned into separate squabbling principalities. Within a few years, Turkish "sultanates" arose in Asia Minor, Persia, Irak (Mesopotamia), and Syria, each the prey of domestic discord and foreign war. They were all Moslem, orthodox Moslem, and on occasion they might unite in the pursuit of a common aim.

The Byzantine Empire in Peril. — The Byzantine Empire was in peril. Asia Minor, which had been saved to the Empire from conquering Arabs four centuries earlier, was now taken by the Turks. Its Asiatic inhabitants, who had long constituted the best agricultural population of the Empire and its most sturdy soldiers, were undergoing conversion from Orthodox Christianity to orthodox Islam. The city of Nicæa, remembered as the place of the first great General Council [1] of the Christian Church, was becoming the capital of a Turkish sultanate. Islam was at last within easy striking distance of Constantinople itself. Obviously a dire calamity had befallen the Græco-Roman Empire of Byzantium, and the final blow threatened. In distress the Emperor Alexius I (1081–1118) appealed directly to Pope Urban II, expressing his regret that there had been unpleasantness in the past between the Greek and Latin Churches and urging the Pope as the chief of all Christians to send soldiers to save the Empire and Christianity in the East.

Effect on Western Christianity. — Western Europe was indirectly affected by the advance of Islam and the Seljuk Turks. Throughout the West there was lively sympathy for the plight of the Eastern Christians and indignation at the stories told by returning pilgrims of their sufferings at the hands of Moslems in the very Holy Places of Palestine. The earlier Arab Moslems, as we have elsewhere said, had been tolerant of Christianity; they had left the Christians in possession of the sacred shrines which marked the sites of Christ's birth and death and burial, and had freely permitted the passage to and fro of Christian pilgrims and also of Christian merchants. It is true that early in the eleventh century one of the Fatimite Caliphs ordered the massacre of Christians at Jerusalem and the destruction of the Church of the

[1] See pp. 430–431.

Holy Sepulchre, but he was probably insane and his successor helped to restore the church. Matters changed definitely for the worse, however, with the coming of the Turkish Moslems. These were comparatively rude, rough, and fanatical, and their protracted and destructive warfare with the local tribesmen and Fatimite Caliphs for possession of Syria and Palestine made it difficult and hazardous for religious pilgrims and foreign traders to travel in the Holy Land.



THE CHURCH OF THE HOLY SEPULCHRE AT JERUSALEM

A church was built in the fourth century A.D. on the supposed site of Jesus's burial and resurrection, which was, and is, a peculiarly "holy place" to Christians and a peculiarly sacred shrine for their pilgrimages. The building shown above, which still stands, was erected by Crusaders in the twelfth century on the foundations of the older church.

Besides, western Europe at this time was full of religious enthusiasm and moral earnestness. The reform of the Catholic Church, inaugurated by the Cluny monks, was making rapid progress under the leadership of such great Popes as Gregory VII and Urban II. There was ardent desire on the part of an ever increasing number of Christians in Western Europe to undertake pilgrimages, under Church auspices, to those distant spots which had been hallowed by the earthly presence of Jesus; and there

was determination not to be kept by Moslems from such a blessed and sanctifying journey.

It should be remembered, moreover, that Western Europe was gradually overcoming the internal tumults of its Dark Age and was now ready, as never before, to turn its new strength and vigor from domestic foes to foreign enemies. The time was ripe for Christianity to take the offensive against Islam.

Christian Occupation of the Holy Land

Crusade Preached by Urban II. — Pope Urban II (1088–1099) heeded the appeal of the Byzantine Emperor Alexius, and at a Church Council at Clermont (in France) in 1095, the Pope preached an eloquent sermon in behalf of a holy war — a Crusade — against the Moslems. All Christendom, he said, was disgraced by the triumphs and supremacy of the Moslems in the East, and it should be the duty and privilege of Christians to go to the help of the Eastern Churches, to rescue the Holy Land and the Holy City, and to destroy forever the power of Islam. It was scandalous, he declared, that Christians should fight one another instead of turning their united arms against the infidel.

A Crusader

The multitude who heard the Pope were deeply moved; they shouted their approval with the words "Deus vult" ("God wills it"); and Pope and Council proceeded to make definite plans for the First Crusade. A truce of three years was proclaimed, during which private war was to cease in Europe and all Christendom was to center its attention upon fighting the Moslems. Volunteers for the Christian army were solicited and were assured of special privileges. They were to be distinguished by a cross worn on their cloak or tunic; they were promised remission of sins in this world and everlasting happiness in the world to come; and the safety of

the families and property that they left behind them was guaranteed by the Church. The Crusaders were to depart on fixed dates and to meet in Constantinople for a united advance against the Moslems. In the meantime, the Crusade was to be preached throughout Western Europe.

Motives of Crusaders. — The popular response was considerable, but not overwhelming; and those who took the cross and enrolled as Crusaders were actuated by a variety of motives. Religious enthusiasm was undoubtedly conspicuous; but, in addition, there were worldly motives, such as love of adventure, desire to travel and see strange countries, ambition to acquire land and wealth, and longing to escape a life of routine and drudgery at home. We do not know how many persons went on the Crusades; the numbers given by medieval historians are certainly inaccurate. Recent careful estimates tend to show that hardly more than 40,000 constituted the Christian armies of the First Crusade.

The First Crusade. — Of these 40,000, some 10,000 were included in badly armed forces which fiery popular exhorters such as Peter the Hermit and Walter the Penniless collected in the cities of France and Germany and led in a disorderly fashion through Hungary and the Byzantine Empire, only to be cut to pieces and annihilated by the Turks in Asia Minor.

The main body of the Crusaders — 25,000 or 30,000 strong — comprised better organized and better disciplined feudal followings of princes and noblemen, prominent among whom were the brothers of the French King, the dukes of Normandy and Flanders, the count of Toulouse, the son of the Norman king of Sicily, and Godfrey of Bouillon (bōō′yôn′), duke of Lorraine. The rank and file were largely French and Norman.

The crusading noblemen, with their feudal detachments, journeyed to Constantinople by various routes. Provided with supplies by the Emperor Alexius and aided throughout the ensuing campaign by disunion and dissension among their Moslem foes, they set out in the spring of 1097 against the Turkish sultanate in Asia Minor. Capturing its capital, the city of Nicæa, they fought their way across Asia Minor, formed an alliance with the Armenians

and then invaded Syria, besieging and taking Antioch. Thence, by way of Jaffa, the Crusaders marched on Jerusalem. On July 15, 1099, the Holy City surrendered, and the Christians celebrated their triumph by merciless slaughter of many Moslems and by magnificent religious rites in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

The Holy Land under Christian Rule. — The First Crusade achieved its immediate purposes. It restored Asia Minor to the Byzantine Empire and it freed the Holy Land from Moslem rule.



A Feudal Castle Erected by Crusaders in the Holy Land

At the same time it gave rise to unseemly quarrels between the Eastern and Western Christians and to unfortunate rivalries among the leading Crusaders. From the first, distrust and dislike appeared between the Greeks and their Latin allies; the Emperor Alexius did not give all the assistance which he might have given to the Crusaders; and the latter were in no mood to hand over to him their conquests in Syria and Palestine. Instead, they established an independent "Latin kingdom of Jerusalem" and

chose Godfrey of Bouillon to be its first king under the title of "Defender of the Holy Sepulchre." In theory, all the Christian conquests in Palestine and Syria belonged to this kingdom of Jerusalem; in fact, however, ambitious Christian lords made themselves virtual sovereigns of a number of petty states, such as Antioch and Edessa (ē-dĕs′ȧ), and even in the remaining territory of the Latin kingdom feudalism prevailed.

Yet, despite growing disunion and internal strife, the Christians occupied the greater part of Palestine and Syria for almost a hundred years. Catholic Christianity of the West was the official religion — though Moslems and Jews and likewise non-Catholic Christians were tolerated — and French was the official language. Trade, especially with the city-states of Italy, was stimulated, and a steady stream of pilgrims, merchants, soldiers, and settlers flowed back and forth between Western Europe and the Near East. For a century the Holy Land was again within the cultural area of Catholic Christianity.

Of course there was no let-up in the warfare between the occupying Christians and the dispossessed Moslems. At first the Christians were generally successful and actually consolidated and strengthened their positions. Later, as religious enthusiasm declined and worldly ambitions came to the fore, quarrels and rivalries multiplied among the Christians and enabled the Moslems to regain ground. At length, in 1144, the Moslems recaptured Edessa, a strategic outpost of the Christian power in Syria.

Failure of the Second Crusade. — In Western Europe the fall of Edessa was recognized as a disaster which threatened the whole Christian occupation of the Holy Land. Bernard of Clairvaux at once came forward as the apostle of a Second Crusade, and at his bidding the Holy Roman Emperor Conrad III and the French King Louis VII took the cross and started with their armies in 1147 for the East. They did not go together for fear that their German and French soldiers might fight each other; and the Moslems, advancing into Asia Minor, experienced no great difficulty in defeating first the one and then the other. Only remnants of the Second Crusade escaped and found their way by sea to Syria a year later. Conrad's attempt to capture Damascus was

thwarted by Moslem valor and cunning and by Christian jealousies, and Conrad returned home in disgust. Louis stayed a little longer but he could effect nothing. The Second Crusade was a fiasco.

Saladin. — The utter failure of the Second Crusade dejected the Christians and heartened the Moslems, and among the latter there soon appeared a unifying genius in the person of Saladin. Saladin (1138–1193) was a Kurd, born in Armenia and educated at Damascus. A devout Moslem, a cultured gentleman, and a brave warrior, he became chief minister and foremost general of the Seljuk Turkish Sultan of northern Syria. His ambition was to oust the Christians from the Near East, and to do this he knew that it would first be necessary to build a strong and united Moslem state. Accordingly, he reduced the neighboring petty Moslem principalities to subjection to the Turkish Sultan, promoted very close relations with the Abbasid Caliph at Bagdad, made war on the rival Fatimite Caliph at Cairo, conquered and annexed Egypt and thus put an end to the Fatimite Caliphate (1171). Finally, on the death of the Turkish Sultan, Saladin became himself the Sultan of a consolidated state which comprised Egypt and North Syria and Mesopotamia and which surrounded the Christian Kingdom of Jerusalem on three sides. Then it was that he assailed the Christians in force. He captured Jerusalem (1187), and his Moslem armies speedily conquered the whole Christian Kingdom except Tyre.

The Third Crusade. — The fall of Jerusalem stirred Western Europe to undertake a Third Crusade. Against Saladin went out from Europe the foremost Catholic princes of the time: Frederick Barbarossa, the Holy Roman Emperor; Philip Augustus, King of France; and Richard "the Lion-Hearted," King of England. Frederick went overland and was drowned while crossing a river in Asia Minor; his army was scattered, and only a remnant of it reached Syria. Philip and Richard went together by water, but they quarrelled and Philip soon returned home. Richard fought on with great gallantry and ability and with some success. Twice his army got within twelve miles of Jerusalem; but he simply could not overcome Saladin or regain the Holy City. At last, in 1192, Richard and Saladin signed a treaty, stipulating

that the Christians should hold a narrow strip of the Palestinian and Syrian coast and should have the right of access to Jerusalem.

The fame of the Third Crusade rests less upon its practical achievements than upon the personal greatness of the chief antagonists: Richard, the whole-hearted champion of the Cross, and Saladin, the preëminently wise and just restorer of Moslem power in Palestine. "Were each," said a chronicler of the time, "endowed with the virtues of the other, the whole world could not furnish such a pair of princes." Saladin died in 1193, and Richard returned to a troubled reign in England and an early grave.

Loss of the Holy Land. — Despite the loss of Jerusalem and most of Palestine, the Christians continued for some time after the Third Crusade to occupy the coast, including the trading towns of Acre, Beyrout, and Jaffa, and some territory in Syria, including the principality of Antioch. Eventually, however, these posts were doomed: one after another was taken by the Moslems; and finally, in 1291, the Christian occupation of the Holy Land ceased altogether.

Revolutions in the Byzantine Empire

The Fourth "Crusade." — What is usually termed in history the Fourth Crusade marked a profound departure from the aim and method of earlier Crusades. The earlier Crusades had been inspired primarily by religious zeal. They had been directed chiefly at the establishment of a Christian state in Palestine and Syria and incidentally at the protection of the Byzantine Empire; and the fighting had occurred mainly in the Holy Land between Christians and Moslems. The Fourth Crusade, early in the thirteenth century, was dominated by economic considerations and directed at the overthrow of Greek rule and the extension of Italian influence; and the fighting was principally within the Byzantine Empire between Greeks and Latins, between Orthodox and Catholic Christians.

Influence of Venice. — When the Fourth Crusade was first preached by Pope Innocent III at the close of the twelfth century, neither the Pope nor the French nobles who heeded his plea and took the cross had any idea of departing from earlier aims and

methods. These Crusaders may have been actuated, even more than their predecessors, by personal motives of worldly gain; but they all expressed determination to go to the Holy Land and to recover for Christianity what had been lost to Saladin and Islam. In arranging for their journey, however, they unwittingly prepared the way for another outcome. They made a treaty (1201) with the maritime Italian city-state of Venice, whereby Venice promised

VENICE

to transport them by sea, and they in turn agreed to pay a large lump sum of money and to give half of their conquests to Venice.

When the Crusaders arrived in Venice to take ship, they found themselves at the mercy of this powerful commercial city. They themselves were not agreed as to precisely whither they wished the Venetians to transport them: some favored a direct voyage to Syria or Palestine; others preferred transportation to Egypt and an advance thence by land into Palestine. However, they did not have enough money to pay Venice the preliminary lump sum which

had been arranged for, and until the whole amount was forthcoming the Venetians refused to transport the Crusaders either to the Holy Land or to Egypt.

Venice at this time was profiting from trade not only with Christians in the Holy Land but with Moslems in Egypt and throughout the Near East, and her governing class of merchants had no great enthusiasm for a Crusade which might interfere most seriously with her trade. Her chief rival and hindrance in oriental commerce was not Islam but the Byzantine Empire, and the shrewd Venetian Doge and Senate now indicated that they would forget about the lump sum of money if the Crusaders would join Venice in an expedition against the Byzantine Empire: Venice and the Crusaders could share the spoils.

Byzantium the Goal. — The Crusaders, after some hesitation and despite vigorous protests of the Pope, were won over to the Venetian scheme. It was easier to win them over by reason of the age-long antipathy between Latins and Greeks, between Catholic and Orthodox, between the West and the East. The Crusaders regarded the Greeks as schismatics (that is, as Christians separated from the true Church) if not as heretics and remembered their earlier failures to coöperate fully with the West in the recovery of the Holy Land. To many it seemed as if a Catholic conquest of the Byzantine Empire would mean the acceptance of Catholic Christianity by the Greeks, and would thereby enable a reunited Christendom to wage more successful war against Islam. And there existed, moreover, a plausible excuse for intervention in the Byzantine Empire. The rightful Emperor had recently been deposed by his brother, and the usurper, Alexius III, was squandering the public funds and failing to resist Moslem invasions of Asia Minor. The son of the rightful Emperor now appealed to Venice and the Crusaders, assuring them that if they would come to his assistance against Alexius III he and his people would accept Catholic Christianity. This was the final touch.

In 1203, the soldiers of the Fourth Crusade, under Venetian auspices and on Venetian ships, appeared off Constantinople. The impressions of the Crusaders at first sight of the majestic capital of that Empire which had come down through the centuries

in unbroken descent from the ancient Roman Empire, have been preserved for us in the words of an eye-witness: "Now wit ye well that they gazed at Constantinople, those who had never seen it; for they had not dreamed that there was in all the world so rich a city, when they beheld the high walls and the mighty towers by which she was enclosed all round, and those rich palaces and those great churches, of which there were so many that none might believe it if he had not seen it with his own eyes, and the length and breadth of the city, which was sovereign among all. And wit ye well that there was no man so bold that he did not tremble; and this was not wonderful; for never was so great a matter undertaken by any man since the world was created."

The Spoils of Victory. — The Greeks had no mind to accept an Emperor at the bidding of foreigners or to abandon Orthodox Christianity; they rallied round Alexius III and defied the Crusaders. Thereupon the Crusaders attacked Constantinople by land and sea, and after bitter fighting conquered the city, deposed Alexius, and restored the former Emperor.

As soon as the Crusaders were again encamped outside the walls, the Greeks rose in revolt, killed the Emperor who had been forced upon them, and proclaimed a new Emperor (1204). The Venetians and the Crusaders now resolved to seize the capital anew and keep it. They again attacked, and after fierce fighting they again captured Constantinople.

This time they treated it with the most appalling cruelty. Murder, sacrilege, arson, and robbery were let loose. Great was the anger of Pope Innocent III when he heard of the shameful doings of the Crusaders. "These defenders of Christ," he wrote, "who should have turned their swords only against the infidels, have bathed themselves in Christian blood. They have respected neither religion, nor age, nor sex."

The booty of Constantinople, and the whole Byzantine Empire likewise, were divided between the Venetians and the Crusaders. Venice, for her share, obtained a section of Constantinople, including the church of Saint Sophia, and everything which might help her to extend her commercial supremacy — Crete, the Greek Peninsula, the Ægean Islands, Gallipoli, Adrianople, and posts in

Asia Minor. A Venetian became Patriarch of Constantinople, and for a time Western Catholicism supplanted Eastern Orthodoxy as the official form of Christianity in southeastern Europe. One



Elmendorf Photo, (c) Ewing Galloway, N. Y.

FRONT OF SAINT MARK'S CATHEDRAL AT VENICE

Note the horses over the central door. These are of bronze and were made by Greek sculptors of the time of Alexander the Great. Later used to adorn the Hippodrome at Constantinople, they were part of Venice's share of the spoils of the Fourth Crusade and the sack of Constantinople in 1204.

of the Crusaders, Baldwin, Count of Flanders, was chosen Emperor and crowned with pomp in Saint Sophia; and under him the Empire was reorganized on a strictly feudal basis, all the chief Crusaders receiving lands and towns over which they were to rule as dukes or counts.

The Latin Empire. — This so-called "Latin" Empire, established by Crusaders on the soil of the Byzantine Empire in 1204, lasted half a century. The mass of the Greek-speaking population never took kindly to it, and it was maintained only by military force and with increasing difficulty. French feudal lords quarrelled with Venetian merchants, and both frequently defied the Latin Emperor. The Greeks were in perpetual unrest and at times in open rebellion. A number of Greek princes, some of whom belonged to the old imperial family, managed to defy the authority of the Latin Empire in certain localities and to erect rival independent Greek states, such as the "Empire of Nicæa," which waged war against the Latin Empire and grew at its expense.

Byzantine Empire Restored but Weakened. — In return for economic concessions, Genoa, the rival of Venice, gave military aid to the Empire of Nicæa against the Empire of the Latins. At length, in 1261, Michael Palæologus, the "Emperor of Nicæa" and a descendant of Alexius III, captured Constantinople, put an end to the Latin Empire, and rëestablished the Byzantine Empire. The revolutions in the Byzantine Empire — that of 1204, by which the Latins got control, and that of 1261, by which Greek rule was restored — were of considerable significance. They showed and intensified the rivalry, even the hatred, between Western and Eastern Christianity. They debased the Crusades, and at the same time they gravely weakened the Byzantine Empire. They made it impossible for Greeks and Latins to coöperate effectively against the Moslems, and thereby they contributed to the later advance of Islam and the shrinkage and disappearance of Christian states in the Near East.

Gains of Venice and Genoa. — These revolutions also contributed enormously to the commercial wealth and power of the Italian city-states. Venice was the real gainer from the Fourth Crusade and from the resulting revolution in the Byzantine Empire. Even after the restoration of Greek rule in Constantinople, Venice retained Crete and the Ægean Islands and the greater part of the Greek Peninsula. And Genoa, for services rendered to the Greek Emperor, received new commercial privileges in Constantinople and other Byzantine cities. The commanding wealth and strength

of the Italian city-states dated from the Fourth Crusade and the revolutions in the Byzantine Empire.

The Mongols

Islam's Lost Opportunity. — It might appear that with Saladin capturing Jerusalem and expelling the Christians from most of Palestine and Syria, and with Christians fighting one another for possession of Constantinople, everything was in readiness for a mighty and successful counter-offensive of Islam against Christianity. Yet appearances were deceiving. The Moslems did not — and could not — avail themselves immediately of Christian disunion. The reason why the Moslems could not assume a general offensive against the Christians in the thirteenth century was because Islam was now confronted by new foes far more terrifying than Christian Crusaders. The new foes were barbarous Mongols, and they were foes alike of Moslems and of Christians and indeed of all civilized peoples.

The Mongols. — The Mongols were wild nomads who had long herded horses and sheep in the barren deserts and rugged mountains of east-central Asia. They were closely associated with another nomadic people called the Tartars (or Tatars), so closely associated that the words Tartar and Mongol are often used indiscriminately to designate the whole nomadic population of Central Asia. In manner of life, in social organization and usages, Mongols and Tartars were akin to those nomads whose distant wanderings and terrible depredations we have already had occasion to sketch — Huns, Magyars, and Seljuk Turks.

Jenghiz Khan. — In the first half of the twelfth century the Mongols and Tartars were nominally subject to the Chinese Empire; but in the second half of that century something happened (we do not know what it was) which caused them to repudiate Chinese rule and to pour out from their ancestral homes in great swarming military migrations in all directions. A Mongol chieftain by the name of Jenghiz (jĕn′gĭz, 1154–1227) united various families and clans and tribes of the Mongols and Tartars, assumed the title of Khan (1206), and, followed by a veritable "horde" of his wild horsemen, went on the warpath. Galloping eastward, he quickly

reduced eastern Turkestan and northern China. Next, galloping westward, he fell upon Persia. He had turned eastward again and was invading southern China when death overtook him.

Jenghiz Khan was as savage a warrior as Attila the Hun,[1] but his military and ruling genius was greater and his conquests were wider and richer; and in constructing a vast Empire he surpassed all his nomad predecessors. He maintained a central capital in Mongolia, and in intervals of bloodshed and plundering he found time to promote order and some of the arts of peace. He organized a regular system of posts and couriers. He treated men of learning with the greatest respect. He urged his subjects to acquire a knowledge of reading and writing. He compiled a code of law. His own religion was a primitive form of paganism, but he tolerated all religions. His personal habits were such as might be expected of a rude barbarian. The joys of hunting, mingled with frequent drinking-bouts, were the normal relaxations of Jenghiz. His wives numbered five hundred.

The Mongol Empire. — Under the immediate successors of Jenghiz Khan the tide of Mongol invasion and conquest rolled farther and farther. In the Far East, China and Korea and Burma were conquered and incorporated into the Mongol Empire, and attacks were made on Japan and Java. In the Middle East and the Near East, Mongol warriors subjugated Persia, defeated and killed the Caliph of Bagdad and destroyed the Abbasid Caliphate (1258), conquered Mesopotamia and Armenia, and in Syria captured Aleppo, Damascus, and Antioch. They were pushing on toward Jerusalem when a force of Egyptian Moslems — the Mamluks — checked them near Acre (1260). In the meantime, still other Mongol tribesmen were penetrating through southern Russia into central Europe. These seized Moscow and Kiev, overran Bulgaria and Poland, and in 1241 overwhelmed the Magyars in Hungary and the Germans in Silesia. At its greatest extent the Mongol Empire extended from the Vistula and the lower Danube to the Pacific Ocean and from the Arctic Ocean to the Persian Gulf, the Himalaya Mountains, and the Malay Peninsula.

[1] See p. 457.

THE MONGOL EMPIRE, 1300 A.D.

Effect of Mongol Menace on the Crusades. — The Mongol menace in Europe distracted the attention of Christians from Islam, and for a time Popes preached Crusades and Byzantine Emperors took the field against Mongols rather than against Moslems. On the other hand, the Mongol invasion of Western Asia diverted the Moslems from undertaking a counter-offensive against Christians; the Moslems were too busy fighting Mongols. The immediate effect of the Mongol onset was to slacken, if not to stop, the struggle between Islam and Christianity.

Assimilation of the Mongols. — It was not long, however, until the Mongol Empire broke up and its conquering nomads adopted the religion and acquired the civilization of the settled peoples whom they had conquered.

In the Far East, the Mongols became Buddhist in religion and hardly distinguishable in manners and customs from the Chinese. Kublai Khan (kōō′blī kän′, 1259–1294), a successor of Jenghiz Khan, was a real Chinese Emperor, and his Mongol dynasty continued to rule the Chinese until it was overthrown by a native uprising in 1368.

In the Middle East and Near East, the Mongols embraced Islam and were gradually absorbed in the general Moslem population of rival khanates and sultanates.

In Europe, the Mongols were pushed out of Poland and Hungary, or absorbed by the native Christian population, and were confined to the plains north of the Black Sea. Here they were known as the "Golden Horde," and Khans of the Golden Horde for two centuries dominated Russia. Eventually these Mongols became Orthodox Christian in religion and Russian in language.

Tamerlane. — In the latter part of the fourteenth century there was a temporary revival of Mongol energy and conquest under Timur (tī-mōōr′) or Tamerlane (tăm′ĕr-lān′). This person, though a Moslem in religion, was about as wild and terrifying as any of the earlier Khans. Becoming chieftain of a tribe near Samarkand in 1369, he subdued west-central Asia, subjugated Persia and Mesopotamia, and in 1398 invaded India and won a great victory near Delhi. Tamerlane died in 1405, and his Empire speedily dissolved, but many of his victorious Mongols remained

in India (where they were called Moguls), and the Mogul Empire which they established there endured, at least in name, until 1857.

Effect of Mongol Invasions on Islam. — Vast destruction and change were wrought in the Moslem world, especially in Persia, Mesopotamia, Syria, and eastern Asia Minor, by the Mongols and Tartars from Jenghiz Khan to Tamerlane. The Caliphate of Bagdad disappeared, and the cultural center of Islam shifted from the Tigris to the Nile, from Bagdad to Cairo. At the same time the political and military power of the Seljuk sultanates was broken, and amid their ruins every Moslem tribe and nationality — Arab, Persian, Kurd, Turk, and Mongol — warred with its neighbors. Out of the resulting confusion one nationality — the Turks — gradually arose to a commanding position.

The Ottoman Turks and Their Empire

The Ottoman Turks. — We have already spoken of the coming of the Seljuk Turks in the eleventh century. Other Turks came too, and especially during and after the Mongol upheaval they came in large numbers, both as nomads and as permanent settlers, into Mesopotamia, into Syria, into Egypt, and particularly into Asia Minor. One of the Turkish tribes which had penetrated into Asia Minor shortly before the time of Jenghiz Khan managed to escape the Mongol deluge, and in the year 1299 its chieftain, whose name is variously given as Osman (ŏs′män) or Othman (ŏth′män), declared himself "Emir (Prince) of the Turks." The Turks who were subject to Othman and his successors were henceforth called the Ottoman Turks.

Othman and his immediate successors were valiant warriors and remarkable statesmen. They annexed other Turkish states and incorporated other Turkish tribes, and slowly but surely they built up a strong military state. It was this rising, growing state of the Ottoman Turks which was destined to become the outstanding champion of Islam and to renew with Christianity the struggle which had been interrupted by Mongol invasions.

In the first half of the fourteenth century, the Ottoman Turks centered their attention upon Asia Minor. They extended their sway over all the Moslem peoples in the region, and to the east

they reduced the Christian Armenians. Simultaneously, to the west, they pushed the boundary of the Byzantine Empire farther and farther back, capturing one Greek city after another — Ephesus, Brusa, Nicæa, and Nicomedia. By the middle of the century they had undone the work of the Crusaders, and, like the Seljuk Turks three centuries earlier, they had wrested all Asia Minor from the Byzantine Empire. They made Brusa the capital of their empire, and the Ottoman Emir assumed the title of Sultan.

Weakness of Byzantine Empire. — As the territory of the Moslem Ottoman Empire expanded, that of the Christian Byzantine Empire contracted. This Empire — the continuation of the ancient Roman Empire — was now steadily declining and deteriorating. Asia Minor was finally surrendered to the Turks. Crete, the Ægean Islands, and most of the Greek Peninsula were occupied by the Venetians. A large part of the Balkan Peninsula was in possession of Yugoslavs and Bulgarians, who maintained independent states of their own and disputed with the Greeks the control of southeastern Europe.

The Græco-Roman (Byzantine) Emperors in Constantinople thus found themselves, by the middle of the fourteenth century, hemmed in on all sides. Their Empire was practically restricted to the capital, to a part of Thrace, and to a narrow strip of seacoast along the Ægean. Within these confines they were confronted not only by foreign foes — Turks, Yugoslavs, and Italians — but also by grave domestic problems: they were short of soldiers and funds and weakened by recurring revolutions and disputes over the imperial succession.

Turkish Invasion of Europe. — In the second half of the fourteenth century the Ottoman Turks transferred their military activities and successes from Asia Minor to southeastern Europe. They crossed the Straits in force in 1356, and in the following year they captured Adrianople and made it their capital. In 1387 they captured Salonica. Two years later, on the fatal field of Kossovo, they overwhelmed the Yugoslavs. In 1393 they decisively defeated the Bulgarians. In the meantime they were seizing islands in the Ægean and fighting the Venetians in the Greek Peninsula, and in 1402 they besieged Constantinople, though here they were

not immediately successful. At the opening of the fifteenth century the Ottoman Turks dominated the entire Balkan Peninsula except Constantinople and a few other posts still held by Greeks or Italians.

In desperation the Byzantine Emperors begged aid of Western Europe, and in alarm the Popes preached new Crusades and besought all Christians to go to the assistance of the Greeks. Some Catholic princes did lead armies against the Turks; the Kings of Hungary and Poland repeatedly tried to stem the tide of Moslem conquest; and the Venetians, now that their own commercial interests were at stake, turned Crusaders and fought manfully against the Turks. But still the Turks advanced.

The Council of Florence. — As a last resort, the Byzantine Emperor with a group of Greek bishops attended a General Church Council at Florence in 1439 and signed a solemn pact acknowledging papal supremacy and uniting the Catholic and Orthodox Churches. Thenceforth he and his successor, Constantine XI, the last of the Græco-Roman Emperors, were Catholics in communion with the Pope and the West. Neither of these Emperors, however, could persuade the mass of his subjects to endorse the union. Obliged to choose between the safety of the Empire and the independence of their Church, the Greek masses sacrificed their political freedom to hatred of the West and antipathy to Rome. Nevertheless, the Pope persisted in his efforts to relieve the Byzantine Empire. He proclaimed a crusade; and a Christian army under the command of a Papal Legate and the King of Hungary set out against the Turks in 1443. It won initial victories and got as far as Bulgaria, but in 1444 it met disaster in the battle of Varna. Constantinople, and with it the Christian Roman Empire of the East, was nearing its death-throes.

Fall of Constantinople. — In 1453, after elaborate preparations, Mohammed II, the ablest and greatest of the Ottoman Sultans, with an army of 150,000 men, laid siege to Constantinople. The city was defended by a pitifully small Christian army, numbering not more than 8000, of whom half were Greek (including monks and priests) and the other half comprised detachments sent by the Pope and by the Republics of Venice and Genoa "for the glory of

God and the safety of Christianity." What the Christians lacked in numbers they made up in grim determination and reckless bravery, and for almost two months the little garrison held the Moslem host at bay. It was only when they were still further

THE MOSQUE OF MOHAMMED II AT CONSTANTINOPLE

On this site formerly stood the Christian Church of the Apostles, erected in the time of the Emperor Constantine and for centuries the burial place of the Christian rulers of the Græco-Roman Byzantine Empire. Shortly after the Moslem conquest of Constantinople, the Sultan Mohammed II destroyed the church and employed a Christian architect to erect this mosque. The plan of the mosque was copied, in certain respects, from that of Saint Sophia (see pages 501–502).

reduced by deaths and wounds and utterly exhausted, that the Christians gave way and the Turks poured in, and even then the gallant band of Greeks and Italians fought on until they were all killed. In their midst, fighting to the very end, perished Con-

stantine XI, the last of the Cæsars and the last of the Græco-Roman Emperors.

The transfer of Constantinople from the rule of the Emperor Constantine XI to that of the Sultan Mohammed II marked the end of the Byzantine Empire and of the political independence of the Greek nation. It meant that the former chief center of Eastern Christianity was thenceforth to be the capital of a Moslem state in Europe. It depressed all Christendom, as it elated the Ottoman Turks and all Islam. For Constantinople was viewed by Christians and Moslems alike as being one of the greatest and strongest cities in the whole world and as embodying most perfectly the traditions of ancient Roman rule and ancient Greek culture. Its possession carried prestige. As Christians had held the city from the time of the first Constantine in the fourth century to the days of the last Constantine in the fifteenth century, so the Moslems were determined to possess it ever after. And now, in the twentieth century, they still possess it. To them it is still *the* city.

Expansion of Ottoman Empire. — Mohammed II succeeded in doing what the later Byzantine Emperors had failed to do. He not only ruled in Constantinople but he brought together within his dominion many territories which earlier Byzantine Emperors had ruled — the whole of Asia Minor and the entire Balkan Peninsula. He did more: he conquered the Rumanian lands at the mouth of the Danube and the Russian and Mongol lands north of the Black Sea.

For almost a century after the death of Mohammed II — from 1481 to 1571 — the Ottoman Empire continued to expand. It expanded, in large part, at the expense of other Moslem states. The Sultans, as the champions of Moslem (Sunnite) orthodoxy, waged protracted wars against the Persians as the exponents of the principal Moslem (Shiite) heresy, and won from the contemporary sovereigns ("Shahs") of Persia the city of Bagdad and the fertile valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates. One of the Sultans (Selim I) fought the Egyptian Mamluks and acquired Syria, Palestine, and Egypt (1517). The same Sultan obtained from a representative of the Abbasid family, who was then residing in Egypt, the title of Caliph. Thenceforth the Sultans of the Ottoman

Turks claimed to be the successors both of the Roman Emperors at Constantinople and of the Abbasid Caliphs of Bagdad, and as such the political masters of the East and the orthodox religious heads of Islam. The Sultans likewise gained a recognition of Ottoman supremacy from the Moslem chieftains of Mecca, Medina, and the other Arab towns and tribes of the Red Sea coast. And by means of growing maritime power the Sultans acquired suzerainty over all the North African coast from Egypt to Morocco, including Tripoli, Tunis, and Algeria.

Suleiman the Magnificent. — In the time of the Sultan Suleiman I (sōō′lā-mān′, 1520–1566), who was appropriately termed "the

BELGRADE IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY
From an old wood-cut.

Magnificent," the Ottoman Empire comprised virtually the same territory as had constituted the East Roman Empire in the days of Justinian and Heraclius. Eager to expand his dominions, Suleiman the Magnificent, with the main force of the Moslem world behind him, turned anew against Christendom.

In 1521 he captured Belgrade and crossed the Danube. In 1526 he defeated the King of Hungary and destroyed the flower of Hungarian chivalry in the terrible battle of Mohacs (mō'häch), and occupied Budapest. Pushing on against Austria, which had sought to aid Hungary, he laid siege to Vienna in 1529. Though he could not take Vienna, he compelled the Holy Roman Emperor to agree to a partition of Hungary, the smalier portion going to Austria and the larger portion passing to the Ottoman Empire and becoming a Turkish province. Thereafter the Holy Roman Emperor, and the King of Poland too, made repeated and protracted attempts to drive the Turks out of Hungary and Rumania, but almost invariably they met defeat at the hands of Suleiman.

In the meantime Suleiman subdued the Caucasus and made the Black Sea a lake within the Ottoman Empire. Simultaneously his warships and pirate-ships wrought havoc in the Mediterranean; they successfully combated Venice and Genoa and wrested the Ægean Islands and other important commercial ports from the Italians and Christendom. The Ottoman Empire reached its greatest territorial expansion and its greatest glory and prestige during the reign of Suleiman the Magnificent.

Turks and Serfs. — The Ottoman Empire was not a national state, any more than the ancient Roman Empire had been a national state. It was a political union, under Turkish leadership, of many diverse peoples. Only in Asia Minor did the Turks constitute a large proportion of the total population, and even there considerable minorities of Armenians, Kurds, and Greeks persisted. In Mesopotamia, Syria, and Palestine, and throughout North Africa, the Turks were a mere sprinkling. In southeastern Europe the mass of the conquered peoples — Greeks, Yugoslavs, Bulgarians, Rumanians, and Magyars — remained, and some of them, especially the Greeks, continued to furnish the Near East with many of its merchants and traders. Most of the conquered, however, were reduced to a condition of serfdom. They were obliged to support the Turks who immigrated in large numbers as soldiers and officials and landowners and formed an aristocratic upper class.

Autocracy. — The government of the Ottoman Empire was an autocracy, not unlike that of the Byzantine Empire which it

supplanted. The Sultan was "commander of the faithful" and master of the conquered peoples. In theory, his word was supreme; he made and enforced the laws; he appointed the local governors and army officers; he declared war and concluded peace. In practice, the Sultan was often influenced or controlled by his harem, army, or officials; and local agents and tax-gatherers were frequently harsher and more despotic than the Sultan himself.



A Janissary in Uniform
From an old wood-cut.

Condition of Conquered Christians. — The Ottoman Empire was a Moslem Empire, as the Byzantine Empire had been a Christian Empire. And the expansion of the Ottoman Empire meant the expansion of Islam. The venerable and historic Christian cathedral of Saint Sophia in Constantinople was transformed into a Moslem mosque, and wherever the Turks went they appropriated the principal Christian churches and converted them into mosques. They set aside a share of the spoils taken from Christians for the financial support of Islam and of Moslem institutions. They taxed Christians far more than Moslems and closed most public offices to the former. They did not allow Christians to bear arms or serve in the Ottoman army, but they seized a certain number of Christian boys every year, reared them as Moslems, and trained them as a special army — the so-called army of the Janissaries — which proved to be a peculiarly effective auxiliary to the main Turkish army.

Some Christians, especially among the Albanians, became Moslems, but the mass of the conquered peoples in southeastern

Europe clung to Christianity. The Hungarians and northern Yugoslavs remained Catholic; the Greeks, Bulgarians, and most of the southern Yugoslavs remained Orthodox. As a matter of fact, the Turks were not supremely intolerant; they did not force conversion to Islam. Indeed, as soon as the Sultan Mohammed II had captured Constantinople, he issued a famous edict of toleration, not only according religious freedom to the Orthodox Christians but constituting them a special "nation" (or "millet") under their own Patriarch and with their own laws and law-courts. Other Sultans created similar "millets" for the Armenian Christians, the Catholic Christians, and the Jews. In this way, the Sultan was enabled to hold the Patriarchs and other heads of "millets" personally responsible for the good behavior of the subject Christians. At the same time the privileges accorded to the several "millets" kept alive the spirit of nationality among the conquered peoples and enabled them eventually to throw off the Turkish yoke and destroy the Ottoman Empire. But this was not to be achieved until modern times.

The Capitulations. — Besides, beginning with the reign of Suleiman the Magnificent, Ottoman Sultans entered into treaties with Christian states, granting to their citizens rights of access to the Holy Land, rights of trade in the Near East, and the right to live under their own laws and to maintain their own law-courts while they were residing in the Ottoman Empire. The first of such treaties — or "capitulations," as they were called — was concluded in 1535 with the King of France. Thenceforth France claimed to be the special "protector" of Catholic Christians in the Near East. It was clear that if the Crusading spirit was dying in Western Europe, the Turkish ardor for the warlike spread of Islam was also expiring.

Christian Conquest of Spain and Repulse of the Turks

Crusades in Spain. — The eleventh century, which witnessed the First Crusade against the Moslems in the Holy Land, witnessed an outburst of crusading effort against the Moslems in the Spanish Peninsula. The peninsula at that time was mainly under Moslem rule; but little Christian states, notably Aragon, Castile, and

Portugal, which had risen amid the mountains of the north, began zealously to attack and drive back the Moslems.

The Crusades in the Spanish Peninsula, beginning in the eleventh century, were almost continuous for two hundred years. They cannot be numbered; they were really one. And, unlike the contemporary Crusades in the Holy Land, they were more and more successful. Sometimes they were handicapped or interrupted by rivalries and conflicts among the Christian states, and occasionally their success was checked by a temporary Moslem triumph. On the whole, however, the Christian states made steady and notable progress against the Moslem principalities.

The King of Castile captured Toledo in 1085; the King of Aragon won Saragossa in 1118; the King of Portugal conquered Lisbon in 1147. At length, in 1212, the combined armies of all the Christian states, under the supreme command of King Alphonso VIII of Castile, gained a great and decisive victory at Las Navas de Tolosa (läs nä′vȧs dā tō-lō′sä). Thenceforth the Christian advance was rapid. By the middle of the thirteenth century the kingdom of Portugal had reached its present limits, and most of Spain was partitioned between the kingdoms of Castile and Aragon. Moslem rule in the Spanish Peninsula was reduced to Granada and a narrow strip of coast reaching round to Cadiz.

Conquest of Granada. — Christian successes were not followed in Spain, as in the Holy Land, by reverses. Indeed, at the very time when the Moslem Ottoman Turks were undoing the work of the Crusaders in the East and destroying the Byzantine Empire, Christian Spaniards were completing the work of the earlier Crusaders in the West and overthrowing the last remnants of Moslem dominion in Spain. In 1469 the marriage of Isabella, the heiress to the throne of Castile, with Ferdinand, the crown-prince of Aragon, paved the way for the political union of the two Christian states and the creation of the modern, consolidated kingdom of Spain. Then, with new strength that came from union and with popular support and enthusiasm, Ferdinand and Isabella organized and directed an eleven years' Crusade which resulted in 1492 in the conquest of Granada and the end of Moslem rule in western Europe.

Conquest of Moroccan Coast. — Crusading had become so vital a part of the history and tradition of the Christian peoples in southwestern Europe from the eleventh to the fifteenth century, and it had been so influential in the building and expansion of the Christian states of Portugal and Spain that it could hardly cease with the destruction of the political power of Islam in the Spanish Peninsula. The Moorish ruler who fled from Granada in 1492 established himself across the straits in Morocco, but he was followed thither by victorious crusading armies of Spain and by Portuguese expeditions too. The Portuguese captured nearly all the Moroccan ports on the Atlantic, and most of those along the Mediterranean were conquered by Spain. For a century and more the Moslem Empire of Morocco was confined to the interior, and its anti-Christian activities were limited to raids upon the coast-towns and piracy upon the western Mediterranean.

Religious Intolerance. — The crusading zeal of the Spaniards eventually begot religious intolerance among them. For a long time, during the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries, their successes against the Moslems were accompanied by striking acts of toleration. They did not force the conquered Moslems to accept Christianity but permitted them the free practice of their religion and even employed them in public office and other positions of trust. Numerous Moslems did turn Christian while retaining the Arab language and much of Arab culture, and these converts — the so-called Moriscoes (mŏ-rĭs′kōz) — were among the most industrious and prosperous people in the country. Gradually, however, the Christian Spanish sovereigns came to believe that the future greatness of the country depended upon compulsory unification of all their subjects in religion and nationality, and such a belief was passionately shared and enthusiastically supported by the mass of crusading Christians. In 1492 the Jews were expelled from Spain, and ten years later the unconverted Moslems were proscribed and banished. About the same time Ferdinand and Isabella established the Spanish Inquisition, an ecclesiastical tribunal under royal control, which labored to assure national and religious unity. Intolerance reached its climax in Spain in 1610 with the expulsion of the Moriscoes.

The Victory of Lepanto. — The crusading fervor of the Spaniards had other effects, more fortunate for Christianity and for the world at large. For example, it inspired Spain to take an honorable and important share in the task of curbing the Turks and setting bounds to the expansion of Islam. The Moslem Empire of the Ottoman Turks was seemingly all-powerful and invincible under the Sultan Suleiman the Magnificent (1520–1566). By land it was overwhelming the Hungarians and expanding into central Europe. By sea it was overwhelming the Venetians and dominating the Mediterranean. Shortly after the death of Suleiman, Pope Pius V came forward as the preacher and organizer of a new Crusade. He formed a "Holy League" with Spain and Venice and called for volunteers throughout Christendom. The resulting naval expedition, under the command of John of Austria, a brother of the King of Spain, met the great Ottoman fleet in the Gulf of Lepanto (lē-păn′tō), off the coast of Greece, and inflicted upon it a crushing defeat (1571). The battle of Lepanto gave the sea-power of the Turks a blow from which it never recovered and ended their aggressive warfare in the Mediterranean.

The Last Crusade. — The Crusade of Pius V, Spain, and Venice did not directly halt the land-advance of the Moslem Turks. Indirectly, it did weaken the Ottoman Empire, and for a century after Lepanto the Sultans had to rest content with the territorial frontiers fixed by their predecessors, while the internal condition of the Empire steadily deteriorated and its government and army grew corrupt. Subsequently the Sultan Mohammed IV (1648–1687) endeavored to resume the offensive against Christendom: he captured Crete from the Venetians in 1669, and in 1683 he laid siege to Vienna and might have taken it had not the valiant King of Poland, John Sobieski (sō-byĕs′kē), brought timely aid to the beleaguered Austrians.

It was then that a new and last Crusade was preached and organized in Christendom against Islam. The Pope, Venice, Poland, Austria, Russia, and France coöperated in furnishing men and money. And for sixteen years these final Crusaders waged increasingly successful war against the Turks. The war ended with the conclusion of the Treaties of Carlowitz (kär′lō-vĭts, 1699),

by which the Ottoman Empire surrendered Hungary and Transylvania to Austria, all lands north of the Dniester River to Poland, and trading ports on the eastern coast of the Adriatic to Venice. The dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire was beginning. Christian states were reappearing in southeastern Europe, as they had already reappeared in southwestern Europe. The Crusades were past.

Significance of the Crusades

Failure in the East. — The Crusades failed to achieve their original chief purpose. They failed permanently to restore the Holy Land to Christianity or to crush Islam. In a sense, they were worse than a failure. They aroused the Moslems to a counter-offensive, to a "Holy War" of their own, which carried Islam in triumph through Asia Minor and southeastern Europe, with the result that Islam was more extended at the close of the Crusades than at the outset. Not only did the Orthodox kingdoms of the Bulgarians and Yugoslavs and the Catholic kingdom of Hungary lose their independence, but the Byzantine Empire — the survival of the Christian Roman Empire — finally fell; and all were supplanted by the Moslem Empire of the Ottoman Turks.

Success in West. — Over against the major failure of the Crusades in the East, must be set the minor success of the Crusades in the West. The Spanish Peninsula was regained for Christianity, and Islam was banished from southwestern Europe.

Civilization Preserved. — It is our opinion, moreover, that the Crusades, though they failed of their original purpose, actually saved most of Europe from Moslem conquest and thereby contributed to the preservation of very significant elements in modern civilization. If there had been no Crusades, it is possible — indeed, probable — that Europe, like Western Asia and North Africa, would have fallen prey to Moslem conquerors, and in that case Christianity might have been largely superseded by Islam. And if Arabs and Berbers and Turks and other Moslem peoples had not been resisted, but had been permitted to overrun and dominate Europe, they might have reduced the West to the same level of intellectual and material stagnation to which they brought the Near East and the Middle East.

For, whatever one may think of the relative culture and behavior of individual Christians and individual Moslems, there can be little doubt that in general Christian peoples have been more progressive than Moslem peoples. In art, in science, in government, in social usage, in education, in industry and material well-being, Christianity has proved to be more constructive than Islam.

What we call the Moslem Arab civilization of the Middle Age was not native to the Arabs or to Islam; it was borrowed from the advanced civilization of the pagan and Christian East, and under strictly Moslem auspices it flourished a comparatively short time

THE ACROPOLIS UNDER TURKISH RULE (1687)
From C. H. Weller, *Athens and Its Monuments.*

and then rapidly declined. Egypt, Mesopotamia, Persia, Syria, and Greece had been homes of great and rich civilizations for countless centuries, and they ceased to be homes of great civilizations only when they were subject to Islam. Everywhere it has always been the same story: Moslem civilization in India and in Java was inferior — and remained inferior — to earlier civilizations in those areas; and among Bedouin Arabs and Mongol nomads and Negro tribes, Islam has never bred a high civilization.

On the other hand, Christianity not only preserved the ancient civilization of the Greeks and Romans but varied and enriched it and inspired the creation of a new great civilization and handed both the old and the new to tribes and peoples that in the beginning were quite as backward and barbarous as any Moslem folk.

There was not much in the tenth century in the way of culture to distinguish Magyars and Scandinavians from Mongols and Turks. Within a few centuries, however, the Magyars and Scandinavians, under Christian auspices, were highly civilized, while the Mongols and Turks, under Moslem auspices, were still primitive and backward. Christianity civilized the barbarians in the West; Islam partially barbarized the civilized East.

Other Effects — The Crusades had significance in many other respects.

1. *Papacy Strengthened.* — For a time they strengthened and consolidated Western Christianity. The territorial losses of Christianity to Islam were almost wholly in the area of the Eastern Orthodox Church, and the territorial gains of Christianity from Islam were entirely in the West, in Spain and Portugal. The Papacy, as the center of the Western Catholic Church and as the preacher of the Crusades, increased, at least temporarily, its moral and spiritual influence and its unifying authority.[1]

2. *Travel and Geography Promoted.* — The Crusades caused Europeans to rediscover Asia and brought Western Europe into close and continuing contact with other parts of the world. Exploration and peaceful missionary enterprise attended and supplemented the military activity of the Crusaders. Thousands upon thousands of pilgrims made the trip from western Europe to the Holy Land, and European travellers penetrated not only into Syria and Persia but also, in the thirteenth century, into China, and, in the fifteenth century, into Africa and India and America. European overseas colonization, beginning with "Frankish"[2] settlements in Syria and in the Byzantine Empire, soon spread across the Atlantic Ocean. Guide-books for pilgrims and tourists, maps and charts for mariners and explorers, and romantic descriptions of strange and distant countries for the edification or amusement of the stay-at-homes, appeared in abundance. By all

[1] But see pp. 686–687.

[2] The majority of the medieval Crusaders and colonists in the Holy Land in the twelfth century and in the Byzantine Empire in the thirteenth century were "Franks" (that is, Frenchmen); and throughout the Near East, to the present day, the Moslems commonly speak of all Western Christians as "Franks."

these means, knowledge of geography and interest in it were stimulated throughout Western Europe.

3. *Commerce Increased.* — The Crusades had important commercial results. The more constant intercourse between Europe and Asia increased the demand in the West for the luxuries which the East alone could supply; and the silks, sugar, and spices which flowed through Damascus and Egypt became the indispensable necessities of the nobles and their ladies, and likewise of wealthy middle-class persons, in France, Germany, and England. In the transportation and distribution of these goods, as well as in the transportation of Crusaders and pilgrims, Italian city-states assumed the lead and grew enormously in wealth and power. The greatness of Venice, in particular, was dependent in large degree upon the Crusades.

4. *Culture Enriched.* — The Crusades, and the resulting increase of travel and trade, rendered Europe the debtor to Asia for many specific things in our modern civilization: new plants, new fruits, new manufactures, new colors, and new fashions in dress; sugar and spice; lemons, apricots, and melons; cotton, muslin, and damask; lilac and purple; the use of powder [1] and of glass mirrors. To this day, in the vocabulary of every European language, there are Arabic words which are lasting monuments to the Crusades — words, like tariff and corvette, relating to trade and seafaring, or words, such as lute, for musical instruments. From the Moslem and Byzantine East, moreover, came an additional stimulus to the revived study of Aristotle and the pursuit of Greek studies which distinguished the intellectual life of Western Europe respectively in the Middle Age and in the Age of Transition to Modern Times.[2] Arabic numerals,[3] algebra, the mariner's compass,[4] and cotton paper [5] were introduced and developed in Western Europe during the period of the Crusades.

5. *Autocracy Aided.* — The Crusades contributed in Western Europe to the growth of the middle class, the dissolution of feudalism, the strengthening of national monarchy, and the rise of autocracy. These matters we shall study in greater detail in the next chapter.

[1] See p. 634. [2] See p. 644. [3] See p. 634. [4] See p. 719. [5] See p. 779.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. How did the conquests of the Seljuk Turks affect (*a*) the Abbasid Caliphate, (*b*) the Byzantine Empire, (*c*) Western Europe?
2. What, in your opinion, were the underlying or general causes of the Crusades? What was the immediate cause of the First Crusade? Of the second? Of the third?
3. Give a brief account of the establishment and eventual destruction of Christian rule in the Holy Land.
4. Describe the career of Saladin.
5. Contrast the Fourth Crusade with the three earlier Crusades.
6. How did Venice and other Italian cities participate in or profit by the Crusades?
7. Explain how the Mongol Empire became a menace to Christianity and to Islam. To what extent did the Mongol conquerors absorb the civilization of conquered peoples?
8. Trace, step by step, the rise of the Ottoman Turks and the expansion of the Ottoman Empire up to the Battle of Lepanto.
9. Describe the form of government and the condition of the conquered Christians in the Ottoman Empire in the sixteenth century.
10. What were the Capitulations?
11. Give an account of the conflict between Christians and Moslems in the Iberian Peninsula.
12. Discuss the Battle of Lepanto and its results.
13. Describe the last Crusade.
14. What were the general effects of the Crusades?

SPECIAL TOPICS

The First Crusade. Munro, *Middle Ages*, 241–253; Robinson, *Readings*, I, 312–329; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. lviii; Cambridge Medieval History, V, ch. vii.

The Kingdom of Jerusalem. Cambridge Medieval History, V, ch. viii.

Overthrow of Byzantine Empire. Schevill, *History of the Balkan Peninsula*, 124–140; Davis, *Near East*, 87–94; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. lx; Cambridge Medieval History, IV, chs. xiii–xiv.

Mohammed II and the fall of Constantinople. Davis, *Near East*, 203–216; Schevill, *History of the Balkan Peninsula*, 195–210; Cambridge Medieval History, IV, 693–705.

Suleiman the Magnificent. Schevill, *History of the Balkan Peninsula*, 216–225; Davis, *Near East*, 220–229.

The government of the Ottoman Empire in the sixteenth century. SCHEVILL, *History of the Balkan Peninsula*, 226–243.

Effects of the Crusades. CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY, V, ch. ix.

Byzantine civilization. CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY, IV, ch. xxiv.

The Tartars in Asia. GOWEN, *Asia*, ch. v.

Hindu and Arabian science. SEDGWICK AND TYLER, *Short History of Science*, ch. viii.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THE TEACHER

CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY, IV, V. D. C. MUNRO, H. PRUTZ AND C. DIEHL, *Essays on the Crusades*. T. A. ARCHER AND C. L. KINGSFORD, *The Crusades*. J. F. MICHAUD, *History of the Crusades* (3 vols.). A. C. KREY, *The First Crusade*. K. NORGATE, *Richard the Lion Heart*. S. LANE-POOLE, *Saladin and the Fall of the Kingdom of Jerusalem*. C. E. CHAPMAN, *History of Spain*. S. LANE-POOLE AND A. GILMAN, *The Moors in Spain*. R. B. MERRIMAN, *Rise of the Spanish Empire in the Old World and the New*. J. K. WRIGHT, *Geographical Lore of the Time of the Crusades*. J. W. THOMPSON, "East-German Colonization in the Middle Ages" (Amer. Hist. Assn., *Annual Report*, 1915, 123–150). R. B. MERRIMAN, *Rise of the Spanish Empire*, I. WASHINGTON IRVING, *The Alhambra* and *The Conquest of Granada*, for atmosphere.

CONVENIENT SOURCE MATERIALS

J. H. ROBINSON, *Readings*, I. R. T. DAVIES, *Documents . . . Medieval England*, ch. v. A. C. KREY, *First Crusade: the Accounts of Eye-Witnesses and Participants*. F. MARZIALS (trans.), *Memoirs of the Crusades by Villehardouin and De Joinville*.

CHAPTER XX

REVIVAL OF AUTOCRACY

General Factors

Political Progress Interrupted. — Between the fourteenth and seventeenth centuries Western Europe experienced a striking change in government. Limited monarchy gave way in many countries to autocracy. By autocracy we mean one-man rule, or absolute and unlimited monarchy. Had the development of medieval constitutional government and medieval parliaments not been interrupted by the rise of autocracy, political democracy might have been established much earlier than it was, and democratic institutions might have taken a somewhat different form. As a matter of fact, however, the development of constitutional government and parliaments was interrupted. And it is the business of this chapter to explain the nature of the interruption and why it occurred.

Effect of Crusades. — The Crusades had something to do with it. They brought Christian rulers of the West into contact with Moslem and Byzantine rule in the East; and from the East, the ancient traditional seat of autocracy, the West derived oriental notions about the scope and method of government. Then, too, the Crusades stimulated trade and travel and thereby contributed to the growth, in numbers, wealth, and influence, of a middle class. This middle class at first favored monarchy because kings protected travel and fostered trade. Besides, the Crusades diverted the attention and activity of numerous feudal lords and powerful churchmen from the internal politics of European states to foreign affairs and distant undertakings, with the result that kings were less handicapped than formerly by feudalism and the Church.

The feudal nobles who during the Middle Age had been leaders in limiting monarchy and in establishing constitutional government

on the basis of contract between king and people, now lost much of their earlier influence and leadership. Some of them were killed off during the Crusades; others emigrated to the Holy Land or to the Byzantine Empire; some settled in cities, engaged in commerce and banking, and came to share the townsmen's desire for strong and stable government; still others were forcefully subjected to the crown and made into subservient office-holders and social ornaments. By the seventeenth century feudalism was in decay, and the feudal lords were in no position to oppose autocratic sovereigns.

Weakening of Church Opposition to Despotism. — The Church had likewise been a foe of autocracy during the Middle Age, but during the succeeding centuries its energetic opposition changed at first to toleration and then to resignation and even aid. The Church, though a foe to political despotism, was no friend to the disorder and anarchy which feudal society at its height impressed upon Europe, and accordingly it was the Church, in conjunction with the middle class, which patronized early royal attempts to check private warfare and weaken feudalism. Thereby the Church contributed to the growth of royal power. When the royal power turned against the Church and sought to enhance itself at the expense of Pope and bishops, the churchmen found themselves so weakened by the Crusades, by previous political struggles, by internal abuses, and by popular criticism and dissent, that they felt obliged to acquiesce in much of what the kings did and eventually many of them became convinced supporters of royal despotism.

Support of Middle Class. — The growth of the middle class and its alliance with royalty were perhaps the most significant features of the centuries of transition from the Middle Age to Modern Times. This class comprised a rapidly increasing number of men of wealth and brains; the kings catered to it, and it served the kings. The middle class furnished the kings with lawyers and most useful officials, with money for government, and with men for armies; and in return the kings bestowed commercial monopolies and other favors upon the middle class. Gradually, under middle-class influence, the institution of monarchy was transformed; the

monarch, instead of being a suzerain of feudal landed lords, became head of a big national business in which the middle class was the chief stockholder. And, for a time,[1] it all contributed to the development of autocracy.

Nationality and Kings. — The sense of nationality, aroused among the peoples of Western Europe by the development of vernacular literatures, was quickened by the Crusades and became in time an important means of enlisting a whole nation in blind obedience to the will of its sovereign. We have spoken elsewhere of the national rivalry and national feeling displayed in the Fourth Crusade by Greeks and Latins, and in the Second Crusade by Frenchmen and Germans. Similar evidences of national feeling and national rivalry appeared, as time went on, between Frenchmen and Englishmen, between Spaniards and Portuguese, between Germans and Italians, Germans and Poles, Germans and Czechs, etc. National rivalries begot national patriotism. Nowadays, if we are patriotic, we show special respect to our national flag. But in those days men expressed patriotism by showing special respect to their national king. Such patriotism on the part of nations assisted the kings of England, France, and Spain to become autocratic.

Revival of Roman Law. — Another general factor in the rise of autocracy was the revived study of the Roman law. According to a basic maxim of the Roman law the prince or ruler of a state not only had authority to make laws but also to break them or to change them at will. This doctrine was absolutely contrary to the medieval theory that the ruler was bound by contract and must respect the fundamental law (or "constitution") of the land. The kings, disliking the medieval theory, naturally promoted the revival of Roman law; Bologna and other medieval universities taught it; and lawyers who were trained in it used it in the service of kings who employed them.

Machiavelli's "Prince." — The maxim that monarchs were superior to laws and parliaments was sustained and emphasized in the political writings of Machiavelli, an Italian scholar and

[1] Later, in modern times, it was the middle class which took the lead against autocracy. See Hayes and Moon, *Modern History*, p. 74.

statesman who lived at Florence in the sixteenth century. In a famous book entitled "The Prince" (1532), Machiavelli attempted to prove, with many ingenious and learned arguments, that monarchs might violate even the basic laws of Christian morality. He urged that a king or prince, in order to promote the interests of his country or to safeguard his own power, had the right to use deception, trickery, poison, assassination, or any other means. Despite protests of the Pope and condemnation by the Church, Machiavelli's book became very popular, and not a few ambitious rulers acted upon his advice.



MACHIAVELLI

From a contemporary portrait (by an unknown artist) now in the Uffizi Gallery at Florence.

Firearms. — One other circumstance which proved favorable to the rise of autocracy was a change in methods of warfare, a change which was brought about mainly in the fifteenth century. Hitherto, in the Middle Age, royal armies had been composed chiefly of feudal vassals and retainers, and they had fought with spears, pikes, swords, and arrows.



EARLY CANNON

From a painting on a manuscript of about the year 1400.

Now, with the introduction of gunpowder and firearms, and with the increase of national revenue, the kings began to maintain standing armies of hired soldiers and to equip them with cannon and flintlock muskets. Once a king possessed such an army, he could use it to subdue rebellious feudal lords and to quell popular uprisings, as well as to wage war against his neighbors. Henceforth he possessed an important instrument of autocracy.

In the following sections of the present chapter, we shall endeavor to illustrate what has been said in this section, by reference to certain specific happenings in the history of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries which had a direct bearing upon the rise of autocracy.

The Weakening of the Church

In the Middle Age, the Catholic Church, as we have seen, was powerful and influential. It provided the religion for the people of central and western Europe and it gave them common morals and common culture. It did a good deal of governing. In the ensuing centuries, from the fourteenth to the seventeenth, its influence and authority, though still great, perceptibly lessened and weakened. This weakening of the Church has been mentioned above as one of the factors favorable to the rise of autocracy. Let us see what weakened the Church.

Effect of Crusades on Papacy. — First of all, the Crusades in the long run had unfortunate results for the Church organization, especially for its central government, the Papacy. In the twelfth century, when crusading zeal and crusading achievements were at their height, the Papacy, which had preached and originally directed the movement, merited and received added prestige and stronger popular devotion. But in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries much of this prestige and much of this devotion were lost. Victories over the Moslems were now succeeded by defeats, and the Holy Land had to be completely surrendered to Islam. In vain the Popes begged Christian rulers to undertake new Crusades for the recovery of Palestine. The Fourth Crusade, as we have seen, was diverted, against the protests of such a great Pope as Innocent III and mainly for economic reasons, from an

attack upon Moslems in Syria and Egypt to an assault upon Orthodox Christians in the Byzantine Empire. Thenceforth, though the Pope might preach Crusades against the Moslems, the actual Crusades were led and directed by secular monarchs and Italian merchants more for national prestige and city trade than for the glory of God and the extension of Christianity.

Too Many "Crusades." — The crusading movement deteriorated in another way. The Popes, carried away by the success which attended their first appeals for Crusades against the Moslems, proceeded to preach Crusades against stubborn Christian heretics and disobedient Christian rulers. There was general approval and support of the Crusade preached by Innocent III against the Albigenses in southern France, but when some of his successors resorted repeatedly to the preaching of Crusades against Holy Roman Emperors and other Christian princes, many good Catholics thought the Papacy was going too far and was using Crusades for purely political purposes, and they refused to heed its entreaties and instructions. An English monk, commenting on a papal appeal for such a "Crusade," wrote: "When the faithful heard this, they marvelled that he should promise them the same reward for shedding the blood of Christian men as was promised in former time for the shedding of infidel blood."

Financial Abuses. — In connection with the Crusades, financial abuses developed in the papal government. To provide funds for the Crusades, the Popes began to grant "indulgences,"[1] similar to

[1] "Indulgences" are commonly and very greatly misunderstood nowadays. An "indulgence" was not a forgiving of sin, and it was never a permission to sin. It was (and is) a promise of remission, in whole or in part, of the punishment which might be meted out to a person after his death for sins for which he had been sincerely sorry and had done penance. The Pope claimed the right to grant indulgences by virtue of the authority conferred by Christ upon Peter to hold and use the "keys of the kingdom of Heaven" and "to bind and loose" upon earth, but the grant of an indulgence was held to be without effect unless the person receiving it was in a "state of grace," that is, sorry for his sins and resolved not to sin again. To obtain an indulgence, the penitent had to say certain prayers or visit certain churches or do certain other "good works." In the Middle Age, going on a Crusade or giving money for the support of a Crusade was deemed a "good work." Indulgences are still granted in the Catholic Church, but nowadays no money payment is expected or made.

those which they accorded to the actual Crusaders, to anyone who stayed at home but contributed a certain amount of money to the papal treasury. Likewise, the Popes began to impose "tithes," a kind of income-tax, upon the clergy and upon tenants of Church lands throughout Western Christendom. At first, the revenue from indulgences and from tithes was employed to defray the expenses of Crusades against Moslems, but gradually it was applied more and more to other and sometimes less popular purposes. It was applied to Crusades against heretics, to "Crusades" against Holy Roman Emperors, and eventually to promote political policies of the Papacy. Yet, even when it was not spent on Crusades, even when there were no Crusades, it continued to be collected.

As time went on and the Popes became accustomed to the spending of larger and larger sums on the maintenance of their power and prestige in Europe, they needed — and discovered — still other sources of income. They charged higher fees for particular services at Rome. They required each bishop to transmit to them the proceeds ("annates") which he derived from his diocese during his first year in office. Some of the Popes went so far as to keep dioceses vacant in order that their revenues might accrue to the Papacy for more than a year. Unworthy and dishonest persons were frequently elevated to positions of trust as bishops and as members of the Papal Court, and the Papacy itself was corrupted by favoritism and nepotism.[1] Not all the Popes of the time were bad or dishonest; most of them were upright and earnest. But good Popes could not remedy all the abuses or fully counteract the bad reputation of the Papacy's financial exactions. At any rate, the financial system of the Papacy grew increasingly burdensome and increasingly unpopular.

Opposition to Political Claims. — The Church was weakened not only by the seeming failure of the Crusades and by financial abuses in its internal government, but also by chronic conflicts with lay rulers throughout Europe.[2] The decisive test of

[1] "Nepotism" is a word derived from "nepos," the Latin word for "nephew," and refers to the practice of certain Popes in favoring their nephews and other relatives and appointing them to offices in which they did little work but for which they drew big salaries.

[2] On conflicts between Popes and Emperors, see pp. 575–577.

strength came at the very beginning of the fourteenth century in the quarrel about matters of taxation and finance between Pope Boniface VIII and King Philip IV of France. As we have elsewhere observed, the outcome was a victory for the French King.[1] After Boniface VIII, no Pope seriously attempted to realize the earlier dream of a "papal monarchy" for the whole of Christendom, and if any such attempt had been made it certainly would have been resisted by the mass of Catholics. An ever increasing number of persons were impressed by the doctrine put forth in the fourteenth century by Dante, the great Italian poet and scholar, and by Marsiglio of Padua, a professor in the University of Paris, that the Church was a purely spiritual, moral, and religious organization and that the Pope and other ecclesiastical officials had no right to dictate to lay states or to interfere in strictly political and secular concerns. This doctrine, though it did not necessarily lessen the religious authority of the Church, did weaken its political sway; and the chief beneficiaries were the national kings.

The "Babylonian Exile." — Close on the heels of the failure and humiliation of Pope Boniface VIII came a temporary subjection of the Papacy to the French kings. King Philip IV, desirous of preventing any repetition of the struggle which he had had with Boniface VIII, secured the election of a friendly Frenchman as Pope (1305). This French Pope appointed a majority of his cardinals from among his fellow-countrymen and transferred the seat of papal government from Rome to the town of Avignon in the Rhone valley (1309). Here, surrounded by French territory and French influence, a succession of French Popes reigned from 1309 to 1377. Because this extended sojourn of the Popes away from Rome seemed to resemble the famous captivity of the ancient Hebrews[2] in Babylon, it has been termed the "Babylonian Exile" or the "Babylonian Captivity" of the Papacy.

Weakened Prestige in Germany and England. — The "Babylonian Exile" further weakened the Papacy and the Church. Hitherto the Popes had been truly international figures, above and beyond the claim of any particular nationality; now by becoming identified with one nationality, they lost international prestige.

[1] See p. 600. [2] See p. 91.

The Avignon Popes were good and gifted men personally, and in most respects they upheld the traditions of their sacred office; yet it was widely believed outside of France that they were mere tools of French kings.

It so happened that a struggle which the Popes waged with the Holy Roman Emperors in the fourteenth century became confused with national rivalries between Frenchmen and Germans. Moreover, the contemporary outbreak of the Hundred Years' War

THE PALACE OF THE POPES AT AVIGNON
The papal cathedral and residence during the "Babylonian Exile."

between the kings of England and France rendered many Englishmen suspicious and critical of French Popes, who were presumed to be allies of the French king. It was this circumstance which enabled English kings to obtain popular support of measures directed against the Papacy. By the Statute of Provisors (1351), the Pope was forbidden to appoint foreigners to Church offices in England. By the first Statute of Præmunire (prē′mū-nī′rē), enacted in the year 1353, appeals from the king's courts might not be taken outside of England. By a later Statute of Præmunire

(1392), papal decrees were not to be received in England without the king's consent.

Italian Discontent. — The "Babylonian Exile" was peculiarly distasteful to Italians and provocative of a national agitation to bring the Papacy back to Rome, or, failing in this, to free Rome (and Italy) from the Papacy. An Italian patriot, Cola di Rienzi (kō′lȧ dē rĭ-ĕn′zē), assumed the national leadership, precipitated a revolution at Rome (1347), set up a republic with himself as "tribune," and undertook to construct both a national Italian state and a democratic Roman empire. Rienzi was an eloquent speaker and writer, but he was no statesman and probably he was half insane. He failed to realize his democratic and national dreams, and in a riot at Rome he was finally overthrown and killed (1354). Nevertheless, the temporary establishment of an independent Roman Republic was striking proof of the existence of national and antipapal feeling in Italy; and of this sentiment the Papacy at Avignon was made aware by a remarkable Italian woman, Catherine of Siena. Catherine was saintly and at the same time patriotic and highly practical. She addressed to the Pope innumerable letters, eloquent, earnest, and shrewd, imploring him to return before it was too late. At length, in 1377, in response to Catherine's entreaties and threats, the Pope did return from Avignon to Rome, and the "Babylonian Exile" was at an end.

The Great Schism. — But even worse things were in store for the Papacy and the Church. The "Babylonian Captivity" (1309–1377) was succeeded by the "Great Schism" (1378–1417).

The Great Schism began in this way. Upon the death of the French Pope who had returned from Avignon to Rome, the cardinals elected an Italian (Urban VI) as his successor. Soon afterwards, the French cardinals (who constituted a majority), regretting their choice, eager to go back to Avignon, and urged on by the French King, proceeded to declare the election of Urban VI null and void and to elect a Frenchman (Clement VII) as Pope. Urban VI and Clement VII thus became rivals: each claimed to be the rightful Pope; each excommunicated the other; each appointed and maintained a separate set of cardinals, bishops, and other Church officials.

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

CATHERINE OF SIENA PLEADING WITH THE POPE TO RETURN FROM AVIGNON TO ROME

From the painting by Giovanni de Paolo.

The split in the Papacy was speedily followed by a cleavage throughout Western Christendom, mainly along national lines. France and countries more or less allied with her — Scotland, Savoy, Spain, and Portugal — supported Clement VII, who took up his residence at Avignon. Italy and countries more or less hostile to France — Germany, England, Hungary, Poland, and the Scandinavian nations — supported Urban VI, who reigned at Rome. This break in the Church is termed the Great Schism.

For many years the Great Schism endured, to the profit of politicians but to the disgrace and scandal of the Church. It did not end with the deaths of Urban VI and Clement VII, for their cardinals kept on choosing rival successors. Many efforts were made to terminate the schism and to restore unity, but they were long rendered fruitless by the ambition or stubbornness of one or the other of the rival claimants of the papal throne or by wars or political intrigues between rival monarchs. In 1409 a group of cardinals from both factions held a Church Council at Pisa, which, despite its lack of legal authority, attempted to depose the two rivals and elected a new Pope. The action of the Council of Pisa only added chaos to confusion: there were now three men, instead of two, each claiming that he was the rightful Pope.

The Council of Constance. — Through the earnest and energetic efforts of the Holy Roman Emperor, and with the coöperation of other Christian monarchs, another and more successful Church Council was held at Constance (1415–1417). The Roman Pope (nowadays recognized as the rightful Pope) voluntarily resigned; the Pisan pretender, a self-seeking rascal, was compelled to resign; and the Avignon claimant, who was Spanish in nationality and stubborn in nature and who had already been abandoned by France, was deposed. Then, in 1417, the cardinals at Constance elected a new Pope, and the Great Schism was over.

The Conciliar Movement. — The Great Schism weakened the Church enormously. For almost forty years two sets of clergymen and laymen had denounced each other. Moreover, the reunited Church was confronted in the first half of the fifteenth century with another difficulty, the so-called "Conciliar Movement." The success of the Council of Constance in terminating the Great

Schism gave vogue to an idea that a General Council of the Church was superior to the Papacy and might control and even depose a Pope; and numerous bishops and lawyers, who shared this idea, sought to carry it into effect. In the Council of Constance and in the subsequent Council of Basel, they affirmed it as a doctrine of the Church and undertook to prescribe what the Pope might do and what he might not do. The "Conciliar Movement," however, broke down. It was too revolutionary. It was condemned and combated by successive Popes and was eventually repudiated by Catholic Christians.

Concordats and Kings. — Yet the fact remains that in politics and government the Church had been greatly weakened, and that many of the governing functions which formerly it had were now taken over by lay monarchs and autocrats. Even the great Popes of the fifteenth century could not regain the international political position which their predecessors had lost. They were obliged to make treaties, called "concordats," which formally conceded to various monarchs — the kings of France and Spain, for example — the privilege of nominating bishops and abbots and controlling the publication of papal decrees in their several dominions. The "concordats" marked a step in the rise of autocracy.

The Hundred Years' War

In this same period there occurred a long struggle between Kings of England and Kings of France, which is known in history as the Hundred Years' War. Actually it was not one continuous war, but a series of wars, with varying fortunes; and the whole contest stretched out over more than a century, indeed from 1337 to 1453.

France Weakened by Feudalism. — The Hundred Years' War began as a feudal war. It will be recalled that the King of France at the close of the Middle Age directly ruled only a part of the country which to-day we call "France." The other parts were in the possession of dukes and other feudal lords who were vassals to him but who did pretty much as they pleased.[1] Among the conspicuous vassals of the King of France were the duke of Flanders (in the north), the duke of Burgundy (in the east), the duke of

[1] See pp. 597–601.

Brittany (in the west), and the duke of Gascony and Guienne (in the south). The King had a good deal of trouble with these powerful vassals: they were ever seeking to free themselves from his suzerainty; and he was naturally anxious to strengthen his control of them.

A Siege of a French Town during the Hundred Years' War
From a fifteenth-century manuscript of the Chronicles of Froissart.

Trouble over Gascony and Guienne. — The situation was complicated by reason of the fact that the duke of Gascony and Guienne was also King of England. This made one of the vassals of the French King as powerful as the French King himself. In other words, the possessions of the English King in France were a source of perpetual trouble and a standing menace to the unity

of the French monarchy. French monarchs, therefore, did everything they could to annoy and weaken the English kings. They tried, though without success, to incite popular insurrections in Gascony and Guienne. They gave aid and comfort to Scotland in its wars with England. They endangered the economic prosperity of England by restricting its trade with Flanders.

Immediate Cause of War. — At length, in 1337, King Philip VI of France, claiming that Gascony and Guienne had legally been forfeited to him, declared war and dispatched a fleet against England. Edward III, the English King, at once trumped up a preposterous claim to the throne of France; he entered into alliance with certain other ambitious vassals of Philip VI, notably with the duke of Flanders, and prepared for a great and decisive struggle. Henceforth it was a question whether the French King could subdue his vassals and expel the English from France, or whether both France and England would be joined in one monarchy under the King of England.

Edward III's Victory. — The Hundred Years' War comprised four more or less distinct stages. The first stage, lasting from 1337 to 1360, was marked by the generally successful campaigns of Edward III and his brilliant warrior son, the Prince of Wales, commonly called the "Black Prince." Edward III repelled the French fleet, and, in alliance with the Flemings, invaded northern France in force. He won an important victory at Crécy (krā′sē′, 1346) and captured Calais (kȧ′lĕ′, 1347). For a time the fighting was interrupted by a terrible epidemic of the bubonic plague (then termed the "Black Death"), which spread all over Europe and is said to have carried off a third of the population of Italy, France, and England. Upon the resumption of hostilities, the Black Prince gained a spectacular triumph at Poitiers (pwȧ′tyā′, 1356). In 1360 the treaty of Brétigny (brā′tē′nyĭ′) was agreed to, whereby Edward III renounced his pretensions to the French crown but secured half of France south of the Loire River and the northern seaport of Calais, not as fiefs of the French King, but as absolute possessions.

French Recovery. — The second stage of the Hundred Years' War opened in 1369 with an attack upon the English by a new

King of France. This time the advantage was with the French King. He had an able general in the person of Bertrand du Guesclin (dü gĕ′klăn′), and besides he profited from internal weaknesses in the English monarchy. Peace was temporarily made in 1395; England kept Calais and a strip of coast from Bordeaux to Bayonne, but surrendered all her other holdings in France, and the English King married the daughter of the French King.



King Henry V of England
From a painting in the National Portrait Gallery (London).

Success of Henry V. — The third stage of the Hundred Years' War, from 1415 to 1420, grew out of troubled internal conditions in the two countries. In France, the King at this time, Charles VI, was physically weak and mentally insane, and the more ambitious feudal lords, including particularly the duke of Burgundy, utilized the situation in order to extend their territory and increase their power. For years France was torn by factional fights and civil wars. In England, a revolution had brought to the throne a new dynasty (the family of Lancaster), which produced two forceful monarchs — Henry IV (1399–1413) and Henry V (1413–1422). The latter of these was an especially bold and resourceful fighter, and in 1415 he renewed the war in France.

Henry V announced that previous treaties had not been properly executed and that therefore he, and not Charles VI, was the rightful King of France. Then, with the active support of the duke of Burgundy, he conducted a brilliant series of military cam-

paigns, winning the famous battle of Agincourt (ä′zhăɴ′kōōr′, 1415), conquering Normandy, and overrunning southern France. Everywhere the English were the victors, and the French the vanquished. Charles VI sued for peace, and the third stage of the war was concluded by the treaty of Troyes (trwä, 1420): Henry V obtained all the territories which had been ceded to the English King by the treaty of Brétigny and also Normandy and Anjou; and at the death of Charles VI the French crown and the whole of France were to be inherited by the King of England. Two years later Henry V and Charles VI both died, and the former's infant son — Henry VI — was duly proclaimed King of England and France at London and Paris. The dreams of earlier English monarchs seemed at last to be realized.

War Renewed. — Not all the French nobles and people, however, accepted the treaty of Troyes; and simultaneously with the proclamation of Henry VI at Paris, a group of French "rebels" gathered around the disinherited son of Charles VI and recognized him as Charles VII. The fourth and final stage of the Hundred Years' War thus began as an uprising of a minority of the French people against the rule of an English King, who, in their opinion, had usurped the French throne. At the outset the advantage was with the soldiers and supporters of Henry VI. The rival claimant to the throne, Charles VII, was a mean and cringing creature, hardly capable of inspiring respect or confidence, and his troops were repeatedly beaten and driven from place to place, until the city of Orleans was the only important town which acknowledged allegiance to him, and Orleans was closely besieged by the English.

Joan of Arc. — The cause of Charles VII and of French national independence was indeed desperate, when there appeared, as by miracle, a poor little peasant girl — Joan of Arc, the "Maid of Orleans." She proved to be the savior and heroine of her country, and the fame of her story has grown with the centuries.

Joan was born in the village of Domrémy, in the Vosges Mountains, of a family of farmers. She had no formal schooling and could not read or write, but she was taught farm-work and housework and the duties of religion by her mother, and as she grew older she was much given to solitude and prayer. She was in her

'teens when she heard mysterious "voices" of saints, directing her to lead an army and to free France from the English. It was no easy task for this peasant girl to convince army officers of her divine mission, or to obtain an interview with Charles VII and

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

JOAN OF ARC

From a modern imaginative painting.

persuade him. But she succeeded — she was so convinced herself, so sincere and so determined.

In 1429, when Joan was about eighteen years of age, she was given command of an army of four or five thousand men and sent to the relief of Orleans. At the head of this force she rode, a strange girlish figure, clothed in a coat of mail, carrying in one hand an ancient sword, said to have been that with which Charles Martel

defeated the Moslems, and in the other a pure white standard of her own design embroidered with lilies and religious pictures. And behind this unaccustomed leader, rode and marched the coarse, rough French soldiers, now overawed and shamed into decency and discipline by her whom they regarded as a crusader and a saint.

Joan of Arc was as remarkable in performance as in promise. She defeated a much larger English army and forced it to raise the siege of Orleans. Then, in a single week, she cleared the English out of north-central France, including the city of Rheims, the traditional place of coronation of the French monarchs. Hither she conducted the quaking Charles VII, and she stood beside him in the cathedral of Rheims while he was solemnly crowned (1429). It was her supreme achievement. In the following year Joan was taken prisoner by the Burgundians, by whom she was sold to the English. By the English, through the instrumentality of a court of Norman clergymen controlled by them, she was condemned to death as a heretic and was burned at the stake in Rouen in 1431.[1]

End of the War. — The English might burn Joan of Arc, but they could not destroy her spirit or undo her work. Her memory continued to inspire an ever increasing number of Frenchmen; and her ardent faith and confidence in ultimate victory gave a wonderful and much needed example to the French armies. From the time of Joan of Arc the Hundred Years' War partook more and more of the character of a patriotic crusade of the French people against foreign oppression. The English yielded town after town and province after province. In 1435 the English lost the help of the Burgundians, who, by the treaty of Arras, submitted to Charles VII and recognized him as their King. To cap the climax, Henry VI became insane, and civil war between the rival princely families of York and Lancaster ensued in England.[2]

[1] Charles VII, who owed his coronation to Joan, made no effort to ransom her from the English but basely left her to her fate. Subsequently, in 1456, the Pope condemned the action of the church court at Rouen and declared that Joan of Arc was not a heretic. In recent times she has been proclaimed a saint of the Catholic Church.

[2] See p. 702.

Peace was finally concluded in 1453, and the Hundred Years' War was over. Beginning as a feudal war, it ended as a national war; and the French were the final victors. Charles VII was master practically of all France. Only the town of Calais remained to the English of their once extensive possessions on the Continent.

A Battle of the Hundred Years' War
From a fifteenth-century manuscript of the Chronicles of Froissart.

Effects of the War. — The French suffered grievously, because the war was fought on their soil. But the English also sacrificed men and money, and centered their attention too long on foreign war, instead of on their own affairs at home.

The long contest promoted the growth of national feeling in both countries. It united the French-speaking people under a

French King, and it restricted the realm of the English King chiefly to English-speaking people.

The war also promoted the growth of autocracy. The kings of England and France were strengthened by the patriotic support of their peoples. Moreover, these kings had raised standing armies of commoners and peasants, instead of relying entirely on unreliable feudal armies of landlords and knights.

Rise of Autocracy in England and France

Wars of the Roses. — The Hundred Years' War, which at least indirectly promoted autocracy both in France and in England, was immediately followed in England by a series of civil wars — the so-called Wars of the Roses (1453–1485) — which directly contributed to the rise of autocracy.

Cause. — The Wars of the Roses were conflicts between factions of the English nobility, headed by representatives of rival branches of the royal family. These branches descended respectively from the duke of York and from the duke of Lancaster, uncles of King Richard II (1377–1399). The duke of Lancaster had deposed Richard II, seized the throne, and become Henry IV, and he had been succeeded in turn by his son and grandson (Henry V and Henry VI).

Henry VI was a good and gentle creature, but quite incompetent; he could not fight and he did not govern; it was during his unhappy reign that the Hundred Years' War closed in disaster and that civil war broke out in England. The duke of York laid claim to the crown and secured support from a group of disaffected nobles and from middle-class patriots who were outraged by Henry VI's misgovernment at home and his surrender to the French. The Yorkists, as the followers of this duke were called, took the white rose as their emblem, while the group of nobles and commoners who were receiving or expecting favors from the Lancastrian King adopted the red rose as their symbol. Armed conflicts ensued between Yorkists and Lancastrians — the Wars of the Roses.

Summary of Events. — We shall not attempt to tell the whole complicated story. After bitter fighting, the Yorkists succeeded in deposing Henry VI and putting their own candidate on the

throne as Edward IV (1461). Then followed ten more years of desperate efforts on the part of the Lancastrians to reinstate the deposed King, culminating in the battle of Tewkesbury (1471), the triumph of the Yorkists, and the murder of Henry VI. Edward IV proved to be a strong King, and during the remainder of his reign he experienced little difficulty in suppressing the Lancastrians. In 1483, however, upon the death of Edward IV, his two young sons were imprisoned in the Tower of London and there secretly killed by their uncle, who usurped the throne as Richard III.

The usurpation of Richard III, together with his harshness and cruelty, was fatal to the Yorkist cause. The Lancastrian claimant, Henry Tudor, raised anew the standard of the Red Rose, and in the battle of Bosworth (1485) defeated and slew Richard III. Henry Tudor thus became Henry VII, and, by marrying the princess who was heiress to the Yorkist claims, he united the Red and White Roses. Nevertheless, it took another ten years for Henry VII to stamp out the embers of the great domestic conflagration.

Effect on Autocracy. — As a whole, the Wars of the Roses contributed to the growth of autocracy in England. They killed off large numbers of turbulent and trouble-making feudal nobles. They quickened the desire of the middle class for strong stable government. They finally brought to the throne the Tudor dynasty, whose members knew how to break through the medieval restrictions on monarchy and to make themselves, in fact if not in theory, absolute sovereigns and autocrats.

The Tudor Monarchy: Henry VII. — Henry VII (1485–1509), the first of the Tudors, strengthened the royal power in many ways. He repressed the nobles and ruled the country with a firm hand. To ferret out and punish political offenders and conspirators against himself, he created a new royal court of law — the Court of Star Chamber — composed of judges appointed by the crown and having authority to try cases in secret and without a jury. Henry VII was very economical in expenditure, which pleased the middle class; and for income he relied upon fines, forced loans, and other devices which did not require the approval

of Parliament. He continued occasionally to call Parliament together and to consult it, but he managed to reduce it to a very inferior position in government. He catered constantly to the economic interests of the country gentlemen and the middle class. He fostered trade and commerce and enlarged the navy. He sought to win international advantage and prestige for England through diplomacy rather than through war: he negotiated a favorable commercial treaty with Flanders; he arranged by treaties for the marriage of his daughter to the King of Scotland and of his son and heir to a daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain.

King Henry VII of England
From a painting in the National Portrait Gallery (London).

When Henry VII died, England was already transformed in most respects from a medieval limited monarchy into a royal despotism. A landed nobility still existed, but it was social rather than political in character. A Parliament still existed, but it was only a form: it no longer controlled the King; it was merely a rubber stamp for the King.

French Monarchy Strengthened by Charles VII. — In France, after the Hundred Years' War, the rise of autocracy was even faster than in England. Charles VII (1422–1461), despite his meanness and ugliness, profited enormously from the stirring events of his reign — the marvelous career of Joan of Arc, the

rising tide of national patriotism, the gradual overcoming and final expulsion of the English, the reunion of French-speaking lands and peoples under one scepter. All these events heightened popular devotion to the crown and enabled even an uninspiring King to do about what he pleased. Two things Charles did on his own initiative and with unusual foresight. He reformed the system of taxation, and without consulting the Estates General he levied and collected new taxes. And he created a standing army of professional soldiers who were paid by him and were therefore directly dependent upon him. In these ways he freed the crown from dependence upon feudal lords for money and men.

King Louis XI of France

Louis XI and Burgundy.—Louis XI (1461–1483), the son and successor of Charles VII, was even worse in unloveliness of soul and body. He was physically deformed; he associated by preference with vulgar companions; and he combined the most hideous crimes with the most grovelling superstitions. Yet as a builder of autocracy he was one of the greatest of the French monarchs. For his shrewdness and statecraft, for his plottings and poisonings, he was noted — or notorious. Louis XI spent his life in reducing feudal lords: some he bribed; some he robbed; and others he put more or less painlessly out of the way. After a particularly hard struggle with a great and powerful duke of Burgundy, Louis succeeded in annexing and incorporating into France the duchy of Burgundy. The wily King also married his

son and heir to the heiress of Brittany, and thereby paved the way for the complete absorption of that important western duchy into the French monarchy.

Autocracy in France. — In the sixteenth century, as the result of religious unrest and dissension and of outright civil war, there was a revival of military power and political influence of the French feudal nobility, but the revival was only temporary. Autocracy had been too solidly constructed in the fifteenth century to be speedily overthrown. It was to survive in France in an extreme form in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.[1]

Rise of Autocracy Elsewhere in Europe

Spain and Portugal. — The rise of autocracy in France and England was paralleled by the rise of autocracy in other European countries at about the same time and in much the same manner.

In Spain, autocracy supplanted feudalism during the joint reign of Ferdinand and Isabella,[2] which was almost contemporaneous with the reigns of Louis XI in France and Henry VII in England. The Spanish sovereigns reaped popular favor from the successful conclusion of centuries of crusading against the Moslems and the final capture of Granada (1492). In the same year, Isabella patronized Christopher Columbus's discovery of a New World and thereby laid the foundation of a Spanish colonial empire which was further to exalt Spanish monarchy and to enrich such Spaniards as gained the favor of the monarch.

Within Spain, Ferdinand and Isabella steadily centralized the government. They reëstablished the Church Court of the Inquisition, under royal rather than papal control, however, and they used the Inquisition, as Henry VII used the Court of Star Chamber, to ferret out and punish political offenders and to assure national loyalty and obedience. They put a stop to private feudal warfare and destroyed dangerous feudal castles; though they enhanced the social glamor of the nobility, they deprived it of political power. They subordinated the Church to the State, by securing from the Pope the privilege of royal nomination of bishops and abbots.

[1] See pp. 821–833. [2] See pp. 673–674.

UNIFICATION OF FRANCE

UNIFICATION OF SPAIN

They filled the chief public offices with loyal middle-class persons, especially lawyers, and instituted special royal councils of finance, state, and justice, which gradually assumed functions hitherto discharged by the Spanish parliaments (Cortes). Medieval restrictions on royal power — feudalism, the rights of vassals, the institutions of national and local self-government — were fading away in Spain. And in Portugal, too.

Scandinavia. — In Scandinavia it was the same. The Union of Kalmar (1397), which had united the kingdoms of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden in allegiance to a common King, was finally broken, early in the sixteenth century, by the revolt and separation of Sweden under the leadership of Gustavus Vasa. Norway remained under Danish rule. But both the King of Denmark and the King of Sweden established autocracy in their respective realms, and both did it in the same way. They favored the middle class, lessened the political influence and power of the nobility, and destroyed the independence of the Church.

Germany and Italy. — In Germany and Italy the Holy Roman Empire had been too weakened during the Middle Age, and was now too shadowy, to enable its Emperor to subdue all his nominal vassals and to maintain a paramount and permanent autocracy. But the Holy Roman Emperor at this time was almost invariably the head of the Habsburg family, and as such he was hereditary ruler (Archduke) of Austria. He might not be an autocrat over all the princes in the Empire, but in Austria he could be, and was, as much of an autocrat as contemporary Kings in England, France, Spain, Portugal, and Scandinavia. Elsewhere in Germany, the feudal princes likewise transformed themselves into petty autocrats, while in Italy there was a marked tendency to change republican city-states into hereditary and autocratic principalities. Thus, though neither Italy nor Germany evolved a National State, both developed the institutions and practices of political autocracy.

Aristocracy in Scotland and Poland. — In only two countries was the rise of autocracy seriously checked.

In Scotland, the nobles took advantage of a succession of youthful monarchs to strengthen their own position and to control the crown. It was not until the time of James VI, in the second half

of the sixteenth century, that a Scottish King ventured to defy the nobles and to rule as an autocrat.[1]

In Poland, the nobles kept the kingship elective and prevented it from becoming hereditary. They utilized their right of election in order to wring additional concessions and favors from the monarch. The result was that in the sixteenth century, while other countries were thoroughly autocratic, Poland remained pre-eminently an aristocratic, if not a democratic, state. Indeed, personal liberty and license were so far extended in Poland as to endanger the country's unity and national independence. Each nobleman gained the right ("liberum veto") to veto any act of the King or of the Polish parliament.

The Change in Warfare. — The almost universal rise of autocracy throughout western and central Europe in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries was attended by a change in the character and purpose of war — a startling change for the worse. There had been small private armies of knights, led by feudal lords, and armed with swords and pikes and bows and arrows, and fighting during a specified number of days, with relatively slight loss of life, for a castle or a toll-bridge or for the fun and excitement of fighting. But now there were large standing armies of professional soldiers, commanded by autocrats, and equipped with firearms, and fighting at any time or at all times, often with great loss of life and destruction of property, for whatever ends their supreme commanders might have in view. The supreme commanders — the autocratic kings — sometimes had national ends in view: to effect the political union of a nationality (as was the case with Charles VII of France in the last stage of the Hundred Years' War); to secure the supremacy of the central government over feudal vassals in a national area (as was the case with Louis XI in overcoming the duke of Burgundy); or to advance the commercial and economic interests of their middle-class subjects (as was the case with various sixteenth-century monarchs of Spain, Portugal, England, and France).

Frequency of Aggressive Wars. — More often the autocrats employed the new warfare for personal and dynastic purposes,

[1] See p. 811.

simply to obtain prestige and glory for themselves, to enlarge their dominions, or to assure a rich inheritance to a son, a daughter, a wife, or other relative. Most of the monarchs of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were guided less by Christian teachings of justice and charity than by feelings of selfish ambition and by the doctrine, set forth most elaborately by Machiavelli, that in their public activities kings and princes should not be bound by the ordinary rules of private morality.

CHARLES V
From a portrait by Titian.

Habsburg Ambitions and Charles V. — Among numerous examples of autocratic ambitions which produced great dynastic wars, we shall content ourselves with citing two or three. One was the ambition of the autocratic Habsburg family. The Habsburgs, it will be recalled, had been hereditary Archdukes of Austria since the Middle Age, and often, too, they had been chosen as Holy Roman Emperors.

In the latter part of the fifteenth century the head of the family was Maximilian, a typical autocrat and a most ambitious and versatile prince. Not only was he Archduke of Austria and Holy Roman Emperor, but by diplomacy, marriage, and war he brought under the autocratic sway of his family the most diverse nationali-

ties and the most extensive lands in Europe. He himself married the heiress of the duke of Burgundy, and, although Louis XI of France incorporated the actual duchy of Burgundy into France, Maximilian obtained through his wife the better part of the inheritance of the late duke — the rich and prosperous country of the Dutch and Flemish Netherlands (Holland and Belgium). Then Maximilian negotiated the marriage of his only son, Philip, to Joanna, the daughter and heiress of Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain; and from this marriage came two sons — Charles and Ferdinand.

GILD-HOUSES AT ANTWERP
Dating from the time of Charles V.

Charles (known as Charles V) inherited the Netherlands, Spain, and Sicily and southern Italy (the last two were associated with the Spanish crown of Aragon), and in time he acquired the Holy Roman Empire by election and the duchy of Milan in Italy by conquest. Ferdinand inherited Austria, annexed the kingdoms of Bohemia and Hungary by marriage and war, and afterwards succeeded Charles V as Holy Roman Emperor.

Rivalry with Francis I. — The French royal house was also ambitious. Charles VIII, the successor of Louis XI, laid claim to the city and duchy of Milan and to the kingdom of Naples,

and in 1494 he invaded Italy and inaugurated a series of wars with Spaniards and Germans for the mastery of the peninsula.

Francis I (1515–1547), one of the successors of Charles VIII, trumped up claims to the Netherlands, to Navarre, and to other places held by the Habsburgs, and was an eager though unsuccessful candidate for election as Holy Roman Emperor. In order to create all possible trouble for the Habsburgs and to make gains for his own family, he entered into strange military alliances with the Kings of Scotland, Sweden, and Denmark, with the Sultan of the Ottoman Turks, and even with rebellious Germans. The result was a terrible dynastic struggle between the Habsburgs and the French royal house, which filled the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and most countries of Europe with fighting and slaughter and destruction.

Peace of Cateau-Cambrésis. — For a time, after the deaths of Francis I and Charles V, peace was patched up by the treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis (1559). The Habsburgs retained Milan and Naples, but ceded to the French Kings the German cities of Metz, Toul, and Verdun. The peace of Cateau-Cambrésis (kȧ′tō′ kȧɴ-brā′zē′), however, proved to be only one of a number of interludes in a dynastic conflict which continued in following centuries.[1]

Autocracy a Feature of Transition. — The rise of autocracy, with all its bad effects, was a feature of the transition from the Middle Age to Modern Times. It was closely connected with the contemporaneous and almost revolutionary changes in commerce and learning and religion which we shall set forth in the following chapters.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Explain the effects of the Crusades on feudalism, on government, and on the Church.
2. What, in general, were the factors that promoted the revival of autocracy during the Era of Transition?
3. What financial abuses evoked opposition to the Church?
4. Give an account of the "Babylonian Exile" and its results.
5. Explain how the Church was weakened by the "Great Schism."

[1] See pp. 802–803, 827–831, 844, 847.



EUROPE, 1500 A.D.

6. Describe the circumstances that gave rise to the Conciliar Movement, the aims of the movement, and its results.

7. Compare the conflicts between the papacy and the national kings in the Era of Transition with the contest between papacy and Empire in the Middle Age.

8. Was the Hundred Years' War a feudal war, a civil war, or a national war between England and France? Give detailed reasons for your answer.

9. Describe the Wars of the Roses and discuss their effects on the government of England.

10. How did Henry VII increase the royal power in England?

11. Outline the development of autocracy in France, and explain the influence of the following persons or events on the French monarchy: the Crusades, the Babylonian Exile, the Hundred Years' War, Joan of Arc, Charles VII, Louis XI.

12. How did Ferdinand and Isabella lay the foundations for autocracy in Spain?

13. What changes in the methods and purposes of warfare accompanied the development of autocracy?

14. Trace, step by step, the rise of the Habsburg power, from the Middle Age to the Peace of Cateau-Cambrésis.

SPECIAL TOPICS

The Hundred Years' War. THORNDIKE, *Medieval Europe*, 511–530; G. B. ADAMS, *Growth of the French Nation*, ch. ix; CHEYNEY, *Short History of England*, chs. x–xi; ROBINSON, *Readings*, I, ch. xx; LANIER, *The Boy's Froissart*.

Henry VII and the business men. CHEYNEY, *Industrial and Social History of England*, ch. vi; G. TEMPERLEY, *Henry VII*, 161–195.

Tudor despotism. CHEYNEY, *Short History of England*, ch. xii; OGG, *Governments of Europe*, 21–25; TEMPERLEY, *Henry VII*, 240–288.

Machiavelli. DUNNING, *History of Political Theories, Ancient and Mediæval*, ch. xi; ROBINSON, *Readings*, II, 9–16.

Making cannon in the fifteenth century. SALZMAN, *English Industries of the Middle Ages*, 156–165.

Methods of warfare. DAVIS, *Life on a Mediæval Barony*, ch. xv; MOWAT, *Henry V*, ch. viii; ROBINSON, *Readings*, I, 466–475; OMAN, *Art of War*, book viii.

Joan of Arc. ADAMS, *Growth of the French Nation*, 130–132; GREEN, *Short History of England*, ch. vi, section 1; F. C. LOWELL, *Joan of Arc*.

Unification of France. ADAMS, *Civilization during the Middle Ages*, ch. xiii; ADAMS, *Growth of the French Nation*, 108–146; HASSELL, *The French People*, chs. viii–ix.

How Spain was united. CHEYNEY, *European Background*, 81–103; PERKINS, *Builders of Spain*, 118–151.

Louis IX. OGG, *Source Book*, 311–324; MUNRO AND SELLERY, *Medieval Civilization*, 366–375, 491–523.

Louis XI and Charles the Bold. ROBINSON, *Readings*, I, 477–485; ADAMS, *Growth of the French Nation*, 136–143.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THE TEACHER

E. P. CHEYNEY, *Short History of England*. A. L. CROSS, *History of England*. J. P. GREEN, *Short History of the English People*. G. M. TREVELYAN, *History of England*. A. D. INNES, *England under the Tudors*. G. B. ADAMS, *Growth of the French Nation*. M. O. OLIPHANT, *Jeanne d'Arc*. C. E. CHAPMAN, *History of Spain*. R. B. MERRIMAN, *Rise of the Spanish Empire*, II, III. P. VILLARI, *Life and Times of Niccolo Machiavelli*. R. PUTNAM, *Charles the Bold*.

CONVENIENT SOURCE MATERIALS

J. H. ROBINSON, *Readings*, I. J. TANNER, *Tudor Constitutional Documents*. E. P. CHEYNEY, *Readings in English History*. R. H. TAWNEY AND E. POWER, *Tudor Economic Documents* (3 vols.). R. B. MORGAN, *Readings in English Social History*. SIR JOHN FROISSART, *Chronicles of England, France, and the Adjoining Countries*. PHILIP DE COMMINES, *Mémoires*. G. C. LEE, *Source Book of English History*.

CHAPTER XXI

DISTANT EXPLORATIONS AND OVERSEAS EXPANSION

Why Europe Discovered the World

Narrow Horizons of Ancient Civilizations. — Throughout all antiquity peoples who lived in one part of the world remained relatively ignorant of peoples in other parts of the world. Ancient Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans appear to have known little about China or Japan and nothing about America. Ancient Chinese had only the faintest knowledge of Romans, Greeks, and Egyptians. And for the ancient Americans the Old World did not exist.

In time, different parts of the world became seats of separate and peculiar civilizations. (1) Europe, the so-called "West," became the home of Christian civilization. (2) Northern Africa and Western Asia, including the "Near East" and "Middle East," became the region of Moslem civilization. (3) Eastern Asia, the so-called "Far East," became the area of Confucian-Buddhist Chinese civilization. (4) India, cut off by mountain ranges and deserts from the Far East and the Middle East, evolved a distinctive Hindu civilization. (5) America, the "Far West," isolated by trackless oceans, developed a very different civilization in Central America, Mexico, and Peru; (6) central and southern Africa, with its negro peoples, remained in a primitive condition.

Isolation Not Complete. — Between some of the cultural areas, there were numerous and continued contacts. Greek armies of Alexander the Great and Greek traders had penetrated in ancient times into India, and subsequently the expansion of Islam carried Moslem conquerors into India and brought India into closer commercial relations with the Middle East and Near East. India also had contacts with China: Buddhism was carried from India

to China, and travellers were frequently passing to and fro between these two countries. Between the Near East and the West there has been constant intercourse since the days of Egyptians, Phœnicians, Persians, Greeks, and Romans.

Why Did Europe Discover the World? — It is very curious, however, that all parts of the world have been brought into close contact with one another only in modern, almost recent, times. It is even more curious that the great explorations and discoveries which made such wide contact possible should have been undertaken and achieved between the fourteenth and seventeenth centuries, not by Chinese or Hindus or Moslems or Aztecs, but by Europeans. Why did Europeans do the exploring and discovering? Why has the modern world been largely Europeanized, instead of being Asiaticized? These are important questions, but it is difficult to answer them exactly and completely. We venture to suggest two major reasons why distant explorations and discoveries proceeded from Europe.

1. **Trade.** — Europeans discovered the whole world because they were traders, and because, for economic purposes, they had greater need of the rest of the world than the rest of the world had of Europe.

Europe's Needs. — Europe is the smallest of the five great continents and has usually been dependent upon the others for products of one kind or another. Her fertile farmlands, to be sure, have long produced enough grain, fruit, vegetables, cattle, sheep, and poultry to feed a large population, besides flax and wool for clothing; although at present part of the food supply is imported, as it was in the days of ancient Greece and Rome. Moreover, Europe has timber and stone for building materials, and mines of coal, iron, copper, silver, and tin. But for some things Europe has depended on other continents from very early times. Many articles are not produced in Europe at all — spices, certain drugs, rare woods, and cotton; and others are not produced in sufficient quantity — silk, gold, silver, and precious stones. In early times, Europe obtained such goods chiefly from Africa and Asia.

European Trade with Asia. — In ancient times the Cretans, Phœnicians, and Greeks were carriers of commerce from Africa

and Asia to Europe. Then the Roman Empire arose, and, as long as it encircled the Mediterranean and included Egypt and Western Asia, it provided means and opportunity for Europeans to obtain luxuries and riches from the East. But with the decay of the Roman Empire, with the coming of the Arabs in Western Asia and of the "Dark Age" in Western Europe, the supply of Asiatic luxuries was lessened and simultaneously the demand for them in Europe decreased.

This was only temporary, however. The Arabs themselves were not only Moslems but also traders, and they speedily developed important commercial relations with India. In Europe, too, the Dark Age was succeeded by the heightening culture of the Middle Age and a renewal of the demand for Asiatic luxuries. Therefore, Europeans, especially Italians of Venice and Genoa, plied during the Middle Age an ever greater and more lucrative trade with the Arabs. Not even difference of religion, not even the Crusades, prevented Christian Italians from dealing with Moslem Arabs. Goods from China, from the Spice Islands, and from India were brought by Arabs in boat and caravan to Bagdad or Damascus or Cairo; and thence, transported to the Mediterranean, they were taken on Italian ships to Europe.

Effect of Crusades. — In this connection, the earlier Crusades had highly important economic results. Not only did they enable Italian merchants to bring more and more Asiatic commodities to Europe; they greatly increased the demand for such commodities. Crusaders, pilgrims, and adventurers returned from the Holy Land with astonishing tales of the rich resources of the East. Not infrequently they had acquired a taste for Eastern silks and spices and other luxuries during their stay in Asia Minor or Palestine, or they brought back curious jewels and strange drugs to awaken the envy or interest of the stay-at-homes. Wealth was rapidly increasing in Europe at this time, and many well-to-do middle-class persons, as well as princes and noblemen, constituted a ready and expanding market for the wares imported by Italian merchants.

Need of New Routes. — Gradually the demand outstripped the supply. The supply was always a bit uncertain, for it depended, first on the Italians, then on the Moslem Arabs, and finally on a

slow, dangerous, and expensive transit by boat and caravan fron the Far East. During the period of the later Crusades, when the Turks were advancing and getting a strangle-hold upon the Near East, the Italian cities lost many of their trading posts, the Moslems did more fighting than trading, and the long transit by caravan and boat became doubly hazardous. As the supply of Far Eastern wares grew more uncertain and unsatisfactory, the increasing demand for them set many Europeans to thinking — not only Italians, but Portuguese and Spaniards and Frenchmen and Englishmen — how they might go direct to places where gold, silver, spices, and silks abounded, without being obliged to employ Arabs as middlemen.

Now it so happened that these thoughts were taking shape in the minds of European merchants at the very time when Christian priests and monks were ready and anxious to extend their missionary activity outside of Europe. This brings us to the second reason why Europe discovered the world.

2. **Christian Missionary Zeal.** — The dominant religion of Europe was (and is) Christianity, one of the most intensely missionary religions which the world has ever known. Christianity began in Palestine. In four hundred years it converted the Græco-Roman Empire and transformed the civilization of southern Europe. During the next eight hundred years its missionaries converted and civilized all the barbarians in central and northern Europe and carried the gospel to Iceland and Greenland. From the eleventh to the seventeenth century thousands of peaceful monks as well as thousands of warlike Crusaders made vain attempts to assure its supremacy over Islam in the Near East.

Comparison with Islam. — Indeed, the only religion which can be compared with Christianity in missionary fervor is Islam. The territorial expansion of Islam was nearly as great as that of Christianity, and it was achieved in less time. But most of it was achieved in the wake of military conquest; and the conquering Moslem armies were checked or halted in the Middle Age by Christian Crusaders and heathen Mongols. The extension of Christianity, on the other hand, was accomplished mainly by peaceful personal preaching.

Christianity, alone among the world's religions, provided its disciples with a sufficiently strong incentive to be adventurous and to go everywhere in search of converts.

Missionary Explorers. — Christian missionaries went. By the close of the Middle Age they had traversed all Europe and were turning more and more in the direction of Asia. It was the very time when merchants were doing likewise. The result was that merchants and missionaries went out from Europe together, and together they travelled to the uttermost parts of the world.

Maps and Compasses. — The demands of trade and the demands of religion, then, explain why distant explorations were made by Europeans. But they could be made on a large scale only when European explorers and discoverers possessed considerable knowledge of geography and navigation. Such knowledge was acquired during the Middle Age, partly from practical experience and partly from Arab instruction. Especially at the court of the Emperor Frederick II, in southern Italy in the thirteenth century, were Arab sailors and travellers and geographers encouraged to reside and to write and teach what they knew. And from Moslem Arabs the Christian Europeans learned much, including, for example, the use of the mariner's compass.

In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries Europe had at last the twofold incentive of trade and religion and likewise the practical means for undertaking distant explorations and discoveries, with such astounding results as had never before been witnessed or imagined in the whole world's history.

Europe in Contact with the Far East

Franciscan Friars Sent to Mongolia. — The direct contact of Europe with central and eastern Asia began near the close of the Middle Age — that is, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. It will be recalled that the Mongols under Jenghiz Khan and his successors were then spreading out from Central Asia in all directions, building a huge empire and warring alike on Buddhists, Moslems, and Christians.[1] Prominent Christians of the time, including the Pope and King Louis IX of France, at once

[1] See pp. 660–663.

foresaw that if the Great Khan and his Mongols were converted to Christianity, they would be most valuable allies in the Crusades against the Moslems and the means of spreading Christianity over a very wide area. Consequently, the Pope dispatched (1245) a Franciscan monk, John of Plano Carpini (plä′nō kär-pē′nē), on a journey which took him through Poland and Russia and on, three thousand miles, to the capital of the Great Khan in Mongolia. John had a rather unsatisfactory interview with the Khan, but returned after an absence of two years and wrote a detailed account of his travels and observations. Shortly afterwards, King Louis IX sent another Franciscan monk, William of Rubruquis (Rü′brü′kē′), on a similar mission. William travelled from Constantinople northward and eastward around the Black and Caspian Seas and spent six months with the Great Khan in Mongolia (1253–1254). He likewise failed to achieve his main purpose, but the book he wrote was informing and popular, and it served to awaken the general interest of Europeans in distant and strange parts of Asia.

The Polo Brothers Visit Kublai Khan. — Both John of Plano Carpini and William of Rubruquis heard a good deal about China, but the first Europeans to visit and explore that country were members of an aristocratic commercial family of Venice. Two brothers, Polo by name, who were engaged in trade in Constantinople, set out about 1260, following the general route of William of Rubruquis but going much farther and finding their way into China. At this time, it will be remembered, the Chinese Empire had been conquered by the Mongols, and Kublai Khan was reigning as Emperor.[1] This Kublai Khan (1259–1294) was an able and enlightened ruler. He founded the city of Peking and made it the capital of the Chinese Empire which, thanks to his conquests, extended from Siberia on the north to the Straits of Malacca on the south. He became very much of a Chinese himself, and he sought to tame and civilize his fellow Mongols. He patronized art and learning, tolerated all manner of religions, and encouraged the trade of China with the outside world. Consequently, when the Polo brothers arrived at Peking, Kublai Khan received them with open arms, listened attentively to their stories of Europe,

[1] See p. 663.

and commissioned them to carry back a letter from him to the Pope requesting that a hundred Christian teachers be sent to China. The Polos returned by way of northern Persia and Armenia and reached the Mediterranean in 1269.

Marco Polo. — The Polo brothers were unsuccessful in getting the hundred Christian teachers for China, but they themselves were so much interested in the Far East that they soon started out on a second trip, this time taking with them a youthful son and nephew — the celebrated Marco Polo. They took four years for the journey through Armenia and Persia and across the desert of Gobi. Then for seventeen years they sojourned in the Chinese Empire, learning the native languages and serving Kublai Khan. Young Marco, on account of his cleverness and shrewdness, earned the special favor of the Khan, by whom he was entrusted with numerous public offices and confidential missions. In this way Marco Polo gained an immense amount of knowledge not only about the Chinese but about neighboring peoples — Mongols, Indo-Chinese, Koreans, Japanese, and Hindus. In 1292 the Polos took leave of Kublai and left China by boat, and, after touching the Spice Islands and southern India, they sailed up the Persian Gulf and thence proceeded overland to the Mediterranean, arriving at Venice in 1295. Marco Polo himself, soon after his return, participated in a war between his native city and Genoa, and, being taken prisoner by the Genoese, employed a year's captivity in dictating an account of his experiences and observations in the Far East. The book of Marco Polo was a most valuable narrative, and it was read with unfailing interest by many later Europeans, including Christopher Columbus.

Merchants and Missionaries in China. — Following the travels of the Polo family, European merchants and missionaries found their way in considerable numbers to China, some going overland through Russia and Mongolia, and others going by sea from Persia around India and Indo-China. An extraordinarily zealous Franciscan monk, John of Monte Corvino (mŏn′tā kôr-vē′nō), after laboring among Mongols in Persia and founding Christian missions near Madras in India, sailed to China and settled in Peking; in 1307 the Pope appointed him archbishop and patriarch

Voyages of Discovery

Observe the land-route and water-route followed by Marco Polo in the thirteenth century. Trace the Portuguese voyages, noting Diaz at South Africa in 1486 and Vasco da Gama at Calicut in 1498. Also follow Columbus on his voyage of 1492, Cabot in 1497–1498, and Magellan's great expedition around the world in 1519–1522.

of Peking and provided him with several assistants. Within a short time numerous conversions were made, including, it is said, one of the Khans (or Emperors), and Catholic bishops were established in important cities of the Chinese Empire. Merchants from Venice and Genoa accompanied or quickly followed the missionaries and inaugurated direct commerce between China and Europe. For a time, in the first half of the fourteenth century, it looked as though the Far East might be Europeanized.

The Ming Revolution. — Conditions radically changed, however, in the second half of the fourteenth century. The Papacy, weakened by the "Babylonian Exile" and the Great Schism, could not or would not give the necessary attention and direction to the new missions in the Far East. The Mongols in west and central Asia accepted Islam instead of Christianity and thus became a hostile barrier to Christian intercourse between Europe and eastern Asia. And, to cap the climax, the Mongol dynasty of Kublai Khan, which had been tolerant of European enterprise, if not decidedly favorable to it, was overthrown in 1368 by an uprising of native Chinese under the leadership of a Buddhist priest. This Buddhist priest founded a new and native dynasty — the Ming dynasty — which ruled the Chinese Empire for nearly three centuries. The immediate effects of the Chinese Revolution of 1368 were the blotting out of Christianity in the Far East and the stopping of direct commercial relations between China and Europe.

The Lure of Far Cathay. — But not all was lost to Europe. Europeans had already travelled far and discovered much. They had learned a good deal about China — they then called it "Cathay" — and also about the "Indies"; and their temporary successes in trade and religion served to whet their ambition to win converts to their faith and to secure for themselves a major part of the almost fabulous wealth of the Far East. If they could no longer travel in safety by land, then they must find new water routes to the Indies and to Cathay.

Prince Henry the Navigator. — The possibility of one new water-route occurred naturally to the Portuguese, in the extreme southwestern corner of Europe. They were already crossing the Straits of Gibraltar and fighting the Moslem Moors and conquering the

Atlantic seaboard of northwestern Africa. Why should they not continue southward by water? They did not know much about the continent of Africa as a whole; they imagined it was big and dangerous; and yet they dreamed that by sailing some distance down its western coast they could round it and then proceed eastward by an all-water route to India and China.

Courtesy of G. P. Putnam's Sons

AFRICA AS MAPPED BY A PORTUGUESE GEOGRAPHER IN 1457
From Synge, *A Book of Discovery.*

To carry this dream into effect was the life ambition of a prince of the Portuguese royal family — Prince Henry, commonly styled Henry the Navigator (1394–1460). Prince Henry was not really a navigator himself, but he set his heart upon discovering the means whereby his countrymen could take the lead in obtaining the chief share of the world's wealth. He established a school for navigators in Portugal. To it he attracted the most skillful Ital-

ian sailors and the most learned geographers of the day; and from it he sent out year after year naval expeditions of fighting men and merchants and missionaries who rediscovered and colonized the Madeira and Azores Islands and crept farther and farther down the uncharted Atlantic coast of the Dark Continent.

Vasco da Gama's Voyage to India. — The Dark Continent proved to be much bigger than Prince Henry imagined, and when he died in 1460 the Portuguese had progressed only about halfway down its western coast. But the work was continued after his death.

In the year 1488 Bartholomew Diaz (dē′äth) reached the continent's southernmost tip, which he called the "Cape of Storms," because he encountered storms there. When Diaz returned, and reported his discovery, the King of Portugal said that the Cape of Storms should be rechristened the "Cape of Good Hope," because success was at last within reach.

Courtesy of G. P. Putnam's Sons

VASCO DA GAMA

A contemporary portrait. From Synge, *A Book of Discovery.*

And the King's optimism was justified, for nine years later, in 1497, another Portuguese explorer, Vasco da Gama (väs′kō dä gä′mä), sailed around the Cape, and continued up the east coast of Africa to Malindi, where he found an Arab pilot who showed him the way across the Indian Ocean to India. When he landed at Calicut, in India, Vasco da Gama erected a marble pillar as a memorial of his discovery of a new route from Europe to the

East. He then returned to Lisbon in 1499 with a cargo of Eastern goods worth sixty times the cost of his expedition.

Results of Da Gama's Discovery. — Thenceforth Portuguese ships sailed regularly to the East by way of the Cape of Good Hope and returned laden with rich cargoes of spices, silks, and jewels. With Portuguese merchants, Christian missionaries established themselves in India, especially at the town of Goa. Under the auspices of a royal governor (or viceroy) whom the King of Portugal sent out to India to look after the trading posts and interests of the Portuguese, both merchants and missionaries speedily extended their explorations and discoveries and secured additional footholds in the Far East.

Portuguese merchants obtained possession of Ceylon, Sumatra, Java, and the Spice Islands; in 1517 they arrived at Canton, in China; and in 1542 they entered Japan. A celebrated missionary, Francis Xavier, preached Christianity with considerable success in India and Japan, and by the close of the sixteenth century there were 200,000 Christians in Japan and even more in India. Though these gains to Christianity were not entirely permanent, and though Portuguese commercial supremacy was only temporary, nevertheless from the fifteenth century to the present day contact between Europe and the Far East has been direct and unbroken.

Europe in Contact with America

The Vikings in Vineland. — We have already noticed that Scandinavian Vikings, back in the tenth and eleventh centuries, had sailed westward and had discovered and planted colonies in Greenland and in a region which they called Vinland.[1] Vinland was almost certainly in North America, but the mass of Europeans knew nothing about it; the Viking settlement soon disappeared and was utterly forgotten. When contact was finally made between Europe and America, it was almost five centuries later and quite by chance.

Columbus' Plan. — Many learned Europeans in the Middle Age, like some ancient Greeks, believed that the earth was round and that the Ocean extended from the coasts of Europe and Africa

[1] See p. 513.

over to the shores of China, India, and the Spice Islands; but no one imagined that the two huge continents of North America and South America lay in the middle. In the fifteenth century, when the Portuguese were endeavoring to find a new all-water route to the Far East by sailing around Africa, it occurred to an Italian sailor from the city of Genoa — Christopher Columbus by name — that the Far East might be reached more quickly and more easily

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

COLUMBUS PRESENTING HIS PROJECT TO QUEEN ISABELLA
From a modern imaginative painting.

by sailing due west across the Ocean. Columbus did not propose to discover America; he had no idea that it existed. He had another theory. He merely planned to make a western ocean-voyage to the Indies. And he labored long, with extraordinary pluck and perseverance, to prepare himself, to convince others that his theory was sound, and to procure the necessary funds, ships, and men for his experiment.

Isabella's Aid. — The plan and theory seemed reasonable enough, but difficult to put into practice. The tiny sailing vessels

of those days were not well suited to long ocean voyages. The King of Portugal, to whom Columbus turned for assistance, deemed it much wiser to confine Portuguese efforts to exploration around Africa. Columbus next appealed to Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, but the Spanish sovereigns were then so busy with their Crusade against the Moslem state of Granada that at first they gave him scant attention.[1] Eventually, through the kindly intervention of certain priests who had interested themselves in Columbus and his theory, Queen Isabella consented, after the capture of Granada, to equip and finance the proposed expedition. Thanks to her aid, Columbus finally set out, in August, 1492, with eighty-eight men and three ships, and with a letter of introduction to the Great Khan of Cathay.

The New "Indies." — Few adventurers have required more courage and perseverance. Imagine crossing the Atlantic in a sailing vessel about one two-hundredth the size of a modern ocean liner! Week after week Columbus sailed westward; his men lost faith and grew mutinous; a month passed, and still the trackless ocean stretched out before them. Never despairing, Columbus held fast to his purpose until at last, on October 12, 1492, the glad cry of "Land, Land!" rang from the lookouts. He disembarked, gave thanks to God, and claimed the land for the King and Queen of Spain. Had he been told that he was discovering a new and hitherto unknown world, he would have been greatly astonished. Little did he dream that the island on which he landed was one of the Bahamas, thousands of miles from India and China. He believed he had reached an island just off the coast of Asia. After cruising about among other islands (which we now know were Cuba and Santo Domingo) and discovering that they were inhabited by a strange people, he returned to Spain and reported to Ferdinand and Isabella that he had found the Indies.

Three times Columbus went back to America (in 1493, 1498, and 1502), carrying merchants and missionaries, adventurers and colonists, and ever searching for the realm of Japan, the Empire of China, and the islands where spices grew. But he found no spices or silks, and the coasts he explored were those of the Carribbean Sea,

[1] See p. 673.

Venezuela, and Central America, rather than those of Asia and the real Indies. The strange people whom he encountered and made friends with were not the civilized inhabitants of China and India. Yet Columbus called them "Indians," and the name "Indian" has stuck to the natives of the American continents ever since.

Cabot, Cabral, and Vespucci. — Columbus may not have been the first European to cross the Atlantic, but he deserves full credit as the discoverer of the New World. For, from the time of his first great voyage, contact between Europe and America has been constant and intimate.

In 1497 John Cabot, another Italian sailor from Genoa, was employed by King Henry VII of England "to seek out, discover, and find whatsoever isles, countries, regions, or provinces of the heathen and infidels, which before this time have been unknown to all Christians." He crossed the ocean from Bristol to Cape Breton Island and reported back that he too had reached the country of the Great Khan.

Three years later, a Portuguese fleet, commanded by Cabral (kä-bräl′), was sailing down the African coast, expecting to follow Vasco da Gama's route to India, when strong winds and currents carried the ships so far west that they touched the coast of South America. The Portuguese landed, named the region "Brazil," and declared it a dependency of Portugal.

About the same date an Italian by the name of Amerigo Vespucci (ä-mĕr′ē-gō vĕs-pōōt′chē), who was sometimes in the service of Portugal and sometimes in the service of Spain, made several distant voyages and wrote some letters concerning "the new world" which he claimed to have discovered. In time, the word "America," derived from "Amerigo," was generally employed to denote all the new world discovered by Columbus, Cabot, and Cabral.

Magellan's Circumnavigation of the World. — Very slowly the astonishing truth dawned upon the peoples of Europe that America was not Asia but a new world. Even after Balboa (bäl-bō′ä), a Spanish explorer, crossed the Isthmus of Panama and discovered a vast expanse of ocean beyond, it was still imagined

that a few days' sail would bring a ship to China. This notion was not dispelled until Magellan (mȧ-jĕl′ăn) had sailed from Spain in 1519, crossed the Atlantic Ocean in a southwesterly direction, passed through the straits which bear his name near the southern end of South America, and then traversed the broad Pacific Ocean. Magellan was killed by natives in the Philippine Islands, but one of his ships succeeded in going on around Africa and thus back to Europe. That was the first voyage around the world.

Other Explorers. — During the first half of the sixteenth century explorations and discoveries went on apace in and about the American continents. Spanish adventurers, fortune-hunters, captains, and missionaries did most. They explored the Caribbean islands, Florida, Mexico, Central America, and the greater part of South America. Portuguese made additional discoveries in Brazil. Frenchmen followed closely on the track of John Cabot, and Norman and Breton fishermen soon frequented the banks of Newfoundland.

In 1524 King Francis I of France sent an Italian navigator, John Verazzano (vĕr′rät-sä′nō), on an expedition of discovery to the coast of North America; he explored the coast of Nova Scotia and New England and may have discovered New York Harbor. In 1534 Jacques Cartier (zhäk kär′tyā′) was dispatched by Francis I to continue the explorations of Verazzano; Cartier visited Newfoundland and ascended the St. Lawrence River to the site of Montreal.

English sailors vied with the others, not so much at this time in exploring the American continents, as in seeking among the icebergs and glaciers north of America and Europe an ocean-route from England to Asia. They failed to find an accessible "Northwest Passage" or "Northeast Passage," but they added much to Europe's store of geographical knowledge, and in Willoughby, Chancellor, Frobisher, Davis, Hudson, and Baffin they left imperishable names in the history of Arctic exploration and human courage.

By the middle of the sixteenth century a New World was opened up to Europe and contact was firmly made between Western civilization and America.

Effects of European Expansion on Other Parts of the World

The explorations and discoveries of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries brought Europeans to Asia, Africa, and America, and produced different results in different places. America was speedily Europeanized; Asia and Africa were affected less immediately and less profoundly.

Effects on Asia. — The countries of eastern Asia — India, China, Japan, and the Malay Archipelago — were thickly inhabited by peoples who had long been civilized. They possessed their own religions and cultures and their own highly developed types of learning and forms of art. Europeans might trade with them and might modify their civilization, but Europeans could not supplant or utterly subdue them.

The Portuguese in India. — When the Portuguese first reached India in 1498, they found a vast, populous country partitioned among a large number of petty and quarrelsome rulers. The mass of the native population, though of various languages, colors, and castes, adhered to the religious faith and practice of Hinduism;[1] but a minority, especially large in the north, consisted of descendants and converts of successive Moslem invaders. The princes of northern India were Moslems. The chief potentate in the south was a Hindu. Between Hindus and Moslems, and also among local chieftains and noblemen, there was much quarrelling and strife. This fact enabled the Portuguese to make some conquests. By supporting Hindu governors against Moslem chieftains, the newcomers obtained the town of Goa and extended their sway over the western (Malabar) coast of the Indian Peninsula and likewise over the western coast of Ceylon. At Goa they established the capital of their Indian dominion, and for a hundred years it was a brilliant and flourishing city. Here the viceroy of the King of Portugal resided; here were the headquarters of Portuguese trade, army, and navy and of Christian missions throughout Asia.

The Portuguese affected India in several ways. They introduced European government on the coasts which they appropriated.

[1] See pp. 381, 388, 663–664.

A Native East Indian Prince and His Court

This prince was an ally of the Portuguese.

They provided a new and large opening for direct importation of European commodities and for convenient exportation of natural resources and manufactured goods from India. They brought in a considerable number of European colonists who settled in the towns on the Malabar coast and intermarried with the natives. Within their territories the Portuguese forbade certain Hindu rites which seemed to them immoral and revolting, such as "suttee," an old Hindu custom whereby when a husband died his widow committed suicide by burning; but otherwise they tolerated Hinduism. At the same time, however, they zealously supported the efforts of priests and monks to convert the natives to Christianity. A sizable percentage of the three million native Christians in India at the present day are descendants of converts made under Portuguese auspices in the sixteenth century.

Portuguese activity in India lasted just about a century — from 1500 to 1600. Portugal was one of the small countries of Europe, and it tried to do too much. It attempted not only to establish a Christian state in India but also to monopolize the trade of the Far East and to dominate all Asia and Africa, with the result that it aroused the hostility both of other Europeans and of natives. Not all the Portuguese viceroys at Goa were statesmanlike, and many of their lieutenants were incompetent or dishonest. Besides, in India, the Moslems were particularly hostile to Christian rule from the very beginning, and eventually the rise of a new Mongol Empire imperilled the position of the Portuguese.

The Mogul Empire. — In 1525 a Mongol chieftain, Baber (bä′bẽr) by name, a Moslem and a descendant of Tamerlane,[1] invaded India, conquered the northern half of the country, and created a unified Moslem state which is known in history as the Mogul (or Mongol) Empire. It lasted, at least in name, until 1857.

Some of Baber's successors are famous. Akbar (äk′bȧr, 1556–1605), the grandson of Baber, extended the Empire into central India. He coöperated with local Moslem princes in putting an end to Hindu rule in the south; he was a wise and just administrator as well as a successful warrior; he reformed the system of

[1] See pp. 663–664.

taxation and prohibited "suttee." In religion, though a professed Moslem himself, he attempted, like the ancient Roman Emperor Julian, to take what he thought was best from all religions and to construct a new creed which all his subjects might accept.



THE TAJ MAHAL AT AGRA

One of the most beautiful buildings in India. It was built by the Mogul Emperor Jahan (1627–1658) as a tomb for his wife.

Akbar's grandson, Jahan (Jä′hȧn, 1627–1658), is memorable as the architect and builder of a celebrated tomb for his favorite wife and for himself — the Taj Mahal (täj mȧ-häl′) at Agra — the most beautiful monument in all India.

Under Aurangzeb (ô′rŭng-zĕb′, 1658–1707), Jahan's son and successor, the Mogul Empire achieved the conquest of southern India and the political supremacy of Islam throughout the entire peninsula, and then began rapidly to decline.

Dutch, English, and French Traders in India. — The rise of the Mogul Empire and the growth of Moslem influence gradually narrowed the political dominion of the Portuguese and halted the spread of Christianity. Simultaneously the Portuguese had to face the jealousy and enmity of other European nations. In 1580 Portugal and Spain were united under one King (Philip II of Spain), and European peoples who were then at war with Spain commenced to prey upon the commerce and colonies both of Spain and of Portugal.

The Dutch organized an "East India Company" in 1602, and within the next fifty years they took by force most of the Portuguese possessions in India and Ceylon. The English organized an East India Company in 1600. They captured Surat on the Malabar coast and acquired Bombay; they founded Madras; and as an outcome of a successful war against the Mogul Empire (1686–1690) they built Calcutta and made it the capital of an English Indian Empire. The French, too, secured trading posts in India during the seventeenth century.

The Dutch, English, and French, who succeeded the Portuguese as representatives of European influence in India, were actuated almost wholly by economic motives. They did secure some territory and they contributed greatly to the weakening of the Mogul Empire in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. But they used their territories primarily as trading centers; they made little effort to plant European colonies or to Europeanize the natives. The result was that while trade grew by leaps and bounds between India and Europe, and India passed more and more under the political control of Europe, the life and civilization of the native peoples were not revolutionized. To this day Hinduism has remained the religion of the majority, and Islam the religion of the chief minority, of the three hundred million inhabitants of India.

China. — China was affected even less than India by the coming of the Europeans. The Chinese were in a better position to maintain their independence. They had had, for centuries, a fairly solid and substantial Empire; and though the Chinese Empire, like the ancient Roman Empire, embraced several different nationalities and religions and was periodically disturbed by foreign

invasions and by civil wars between rival generals and chieftains, it possessed an element of extraordinary strength in the distinctive common culture which overspread its different provinces and its varied peoples. The culture of the Chinese Empire was expressed in widespread veneration for the old Chinese classics, in the use by scholars of a common written language, in certain social customs, in various forms of art, in popular devotion to the teachings of Confucius, and especially in ancestor-worship and emperor-worship. Those who shared this culture, the people of the Chinese Empire, were "civilized"; all outside, in Chinese opinion, were "barbarians." Mongols, Tartars, and other "barbarians" who began by invading China, always ended by becoming "civilized," that is, by adopting Chinese customs. Foreign religions, such as Buddhism and Islam, made headway in the Empire only in measure as they adapted themselves to Chinese culture. Buddhism had been very adaptable, and it had made great headway.

Europeans in China. — It will be recalled that a popular uprising against the foreign Mongol dynasty in 1368 had resulted in seating the native Ming dynasty upon the throne of the Chinese Empire and in putting a stop to the activity of European traders and missionaries.[1] It was not until the sixteenth century that Western Europe renewed its contacts with China, and even then no serious attempt was made to overthrow the Chinese Empire or to subvert its civilization. The Portuguese arrived at Canton in 1517, but they were content to trade peacefully; and beyond establishing a permanent settlement on the island of Macao (mȧ-kä′ō, near Canton), they did not encroach upon the territory or independence of the Empire. In the seventeenth century both the English and the Dutch obtained similar rights to use the harbor of Canton and to trade with southern China; but they too confined themselves strictly to commercial activities.

Missionaries in China. — Christian missionaries resumed their labors in China in the latter part of the sixteenth century; and under the leadership of an Italian scholar and priest, Matteo Ricci (mȧ-tā′ō rēt′chē), they made noteworthy progress.

Ricci himself, after spending four years at Goa (in India),

[1] See p. 722.

landed at Canton in 1582 and so impressed the Chinese upper classes with his knowledge of mathematics, astronomy, and geography, that he was permitted to come to Peking (1601) and was employed as official scientific adviser to the Emperor. Ricci mastered the Chinese language and the Chinese classics; he wrote many learned works in Chinese; and he sought to show that Christianity was a supplement to Chinese culture rather than a substitute for it. He died at Peking in 1610, but his work was carried on by his associates and successors.

A Seventeenth-century Chinese Convert to Christianity

Dr. Siu Colo, a high official at the court of the Emperor of China and a zealous Christian. He translated Euclid's Geometry into Chinese in order to show his fellow countrymen what he thought was the higher scientific achievement of Europeans.

Especially rapid were the gains of Christianity after the overthrow of the Ming dynasty and the accession of the Manchu dynasty in 1644. In 1685 there were three Catholic dioceses in China — Peking, Nanking, and Macao — with a hundred churches and several hundred thousand members.

But disputes broke out among the missionaries as to how far they might go in reconciling Christianity with Chinese customs and ideas; the upper classes in the country grew scornful; and some of the Emperors and their officials persecuted the Christians. At length, in 1724, Christianity was forbidden in China, and its missionaries and converts were banished or threatened with death.

It was not until the nineteenth century that the Europeanizing of China was seriously begun. In the meantime the Chinese

learned a little bit about Europe from their commercial contacts with Portuguese, Dutch, and English at Canton.

Japan. — Japan, when the Portuguese reached it in 1542, was an island Empire, which in theory was ruled by an Emperor (called the Mikado) supposed to be descended from a very ancient "son of heaven." Actually, the government of the Empire was not very different from that of the Merovingians[1] in France. The Emperor was a mere figurehead; and the real power was in the hands of great feudal landlords and warriors, the so-called "daimios," one of whom, styled the "Shogun," was a kind of mayor of the palace.

The Japanese people had a language of their own, but they wrote it in Chinese characters; and in many other respects they borrowed their culture from China. The official state religion, called "Shinto," included worship of the Emperor and certain other public ceremonies; but the majority of the people had been converted to Buddhism by Korean and Chinese missionaries, and Buddhism and Shinto were inextricably interwoven in the life and thought of Japan.

Francis Xavier. — The Japanese received the Portuguese at first with kindness and enthusiasm. They were eager to trade, and they soon displayed a willingness to listen to Christian missionaries. They encouraged the Portuguese to establish a commercial post on the island of Kiushiu; and, thanks to the preaching of Christian missionaries, led by the famous Francis Xavier (zăv'ĭ-ĕr), many Japanese accepted Christianity and were baptized. The number of native Christians rose to 150,000 in 1580, to 200,000 in 1590, and to a million and a half in 1600. It seemed for a time as though Japan would be completely and speedily Christianized.

Japanese Reaction against Christianity. — But it was not to be. There were too many difficulties in the way. What chiefly enabled the Portuguese and Christianity to make the headway they did, was the fact that a few daimios accepted Christianity and obliged their subjects to do likewise, in order to obtain for themselves special commercial privileges and to secure Portuguese military assistance in their feudal wars against other daimios. But this very fact

[1] See p. 488.

A Japanese Painting of the Seventeenth Century

This is one from a set of twenty-four paintings of "Japanese Artisans," attributed to Mitsuoki Tosa, sometimes called Josho, who was a famous painter and Buddhist priest in the seventeenth century.

This particular painting is of artisans engaged in dyeing cloth and in making patterns and designs on it. The painting shows the method of work and the costumes of the workers in the Japan of that day.

alarmed the other daimios and filled the Shogun with dread lest the spread of Christianity should enable foreigners to overturn the government and destroy the independence of the country; and the Buddhist priests complained bitterly of the intolerance and fanaticism of Christian missionaries. Besides, the Dutch, the great commercial rivals of the Portuguese, arrived in Japan early in the seventeenth century and lost no time in urging the Japanese to expel the Portuguese. Already various daimios and the Shogun had issued decrees against Christianity, but the decrees had not been enforced. In 1614 the Shogun Iyeyasu (ē′yĕ-yä′sŏŏ) issued a most fateful decree, ordering that all foreign priests should be removed from Japan, that all churches should be demolished, and that the converts should be compelled to renounce Christianity. And Iyeyasu proceeded to enforce his decree. Many missionaries and converts offered resistance, and a bitter struggle ensued. Priests and friars were tortured and killed; some were burnt alive; thousands of converts were slaughtered.

Japan Cut Off from the World. — In 1636 the Japanese government ordained that no Japanese vessel should go abroad; that no Japanese subject should leave the country; and that no ocean-going ship should be built in Japan. Two years later the Portuguese traders were expelled; and contact between Japan and Europe ceased altogether, except that a few Dutch merchants were permitted, under strict supervision, to reside on a little island near Nagasaki and to do a little trading. Except for this, Japan was effectually closed to Europeans from 1638 to 1853. It meant that for more than two centuries Japan was deprived of the advantages, as well as of the disadvantages, of foreign influence, and that she stood comparatively still in science and invention, while the rest of the world progressed.

The Dutch East Indies. — In the Malay Archipelago — Sumatra, Java, the Spice Islands, etc. — which had once been Hindu and Buddhist but had later been converted to Islam, the Portuguese established themselves in the sixteenth century, only to be ousted in the seventeenth century by the Dutch. The Dutch soon monopolized the commerce of these rich islands, gradually extended political dominion over them, and founded the important

city of Batavia (on the island of Java). They made it the political capital and trading center of their East Indian Empire. But here as elsewhere the Dutch were actuated primarily by economic motives and made no serious attempt to Europeanize the natives.

Spain in the Philippines. — Only two parts of Asia were permanently Christianized and Europeanized. One was the archipelago off the southeast coast of Asia — the Philippine Islands. The islands were visited in the sixteenth century by Magellan and other Spanish explorers, traders and missionaries. In 1542 the islands were formally annexed to Spain and named the Philippine Islands in honor of the crown-prince who later became King Philip II.[1] In 1571 the city of Manila was founded and became the capital. The natives whom the Spaniards encountered were not so civilized as the Hindus, Chinese, and Japanese. They submitted to Spanish governors, learned the Spanish language, and were converted to Christianity. The Christian Filipinos of the present day stand unique as the only large mass of Eastern Asiatics who have been converted to Christianity and Europeanized.

Russian Expansion in Siberia. — In northern Asia, the bleak and sparsely inhabited region which we call Siberia was colonized by Russian settlers in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The first treaty concluded by China with a European nation was the treaty of 1689 which fixed the Amur River as the frontier between the Chinese Empire and Russian Siberia.

European Expansion in America. — The effects of European expansion on Asia, excepting the Philippine Islands and Siberia, were almost entirely economic and political. The case with the "New World" was quite different: the effects of European expansion on America were religious and cultural as well as economic and political. The American continents became real appendages to Europe.

Discovery Followed by Conquest. — The greater part of America was inhabited at the time of Columbus by primitive tribes of "redmen" or "Indians" who were not vastly different in customs and manners from the primitive tribes of Germans and Slavs that

[1] See pp. 801–802.

had invaded the ancient Roman Empire and been converted to Christianity. These Indian tribes received the European discoverers and explorers sometimes with friendliness and sometimes with hostility. Some of them were easily tamed by the more civilized invaders and immigrants, and others were warred against and subdued with great difficulty and mutual cruelty. But the



ONE OF THE GREAT NATIVE MONUMENTS FOUND BY THE SPANIARDS IN AMERICA

The great pyramid at Xochicalco, built by American Indians centuries before the conquest of Mexico and Central America by Spain.

outstanding fact about the contact of Europe with America was that discovery and exploration were quickly followed by conquest of the Indians and colonization by Europeans.

Conquest of Mexico by Cortez. — In Mexico and Peru the Spanish explorers encountered native states and peoples in a relatively high stage of civilization;[1] but these, like the more primitive Indians, were rapidly subjugated.

The story of the conquest of the Aztec Empire by Cortez (kôr′-tĕz), for example, reads like a romance. Hernando Cortez was still a young man when he landed on the coast of Mexico in 1519. The

[1] See pp. 115–118.

expedition which he commanded consisted of ten ships, six or seven hundred Spanish soldiers, eighteen horses, and a few pieces of cannon — an expedition absurdly inadequate, we might suppose, for the conquest of an extensive Empire. But the natives whom Cortez first met were astounded and overawed by sound of cannon and sight of horses and ocean-going ships, all new objects to them; they thought Cortez was a god and they offered little or no resistance to him. He himself was bold and daring and absolutely unscrupulous. He seized land and laid the foundations for the city of Vera Cruz, and then, having burned his ships in order to cut off the possibility of retreat, he marched his little army into the interior. He was aided by the internal condition of the Aztec Empire: the Empire was in decline and the Emperor Montezuma was harassed by rebellious vassals (called "caciques") who defied his authority and some of whom gave assistance to the Spaniards. After some fighting, Cortez, with his handful of Spaniards and with 6000 native allies, reached Mexico City and was received by Montezuma with great pomp and outward show of friendship. Soon, however, Montezuma ordered the killing of a few Spaniards at Vera Cruz, and then Cortez struck. He seized and imprisoned the hapless Emperor and extorted from him the recognition of the sovereignty of Spain and the payment of 600,000 marks of pure gold and a prodigious quantity of precious stones. Mexicans rose in revolt, killed Montezuma as the tool of the Spaniards, chose a new Emperor, and gave battle to Cortez in the plain of Otumba. Here the fate of the Aztec Empire was decided. Cortez won an overwhelming victory (1520), which he followed up by retaking Mexico City and establishing Spanish authority throughout the country.

Conquest of Peru by Pizarro. — What Cortez achieved in Mexico was paralleled in Peru by Francisco Pizarro, a Spanish soldier of fortune, who had accompanied Balboa in the discovery of the Pacific Ocean. In 1531, he set out from Panama with three ships, 180 men, and 27 horses, for the conquest of the Empire of the Incas. And, thanks to the valor and cunning of Pizarro and his companions, the magnificent city of Cuzco was captured and the Peruvians were subjected to Spanish rule. In Peru, as in

Mexico, the conquerors enriched themselves with enormous treasures of gold and silver and precious stones, with rich mines and vast estates.

Colonial Policy of Spain and Portugal. — In the sixteenth century the Spaniards extended their conquests, not only over the Aztec Empire and the Empire of the Incas, but in and around the Caribbean Sea, throughout Central America, and over the greater part of South America. Simultaneously the Portuguese were appropriating Brazil.

Spaniards and Portuguese pursued much the same policies in the New World. They established colonial governments directly dependent upon the mother-country. They fostered emigration to the colonies. They divided up the land into large estates, giving some to the conquerors and colonists and some to the Church. They promoted the mining of the precious metals and the pursuit of agriculture. They monopolized the commerce between the colonies and the mother-country. They encouraged the natives to learn and use the Spanish or Portuguese language and to become Christian. They granted important privileges to missionaries, and it was these who instructed and baptized the Indians, built churches, and established schools. The first universities in the New World were founded by the Spaniards at Lima and Mexico City in the sixteenth century.

Exploitation of Indians. — Often the desire of Spanish and Portuguese colonists to make rapid and easy fortunes led them to oppress the subjugated Indians, and, at least in the case of the primitive Indians in the Caribbean islands, to reduce them to the position of slavery. This aroused protest from missionaries who were intent upon Christianizing the Indians and setting them a good example of Christian kindness and charity. The sovereigns in Europe generally took the part of the missionaries and did what they could to restrain the greed and cruelty of the colonists and to protect the natives; but they were too far away to have their wishes and commands always respected, and in the Caribbean Islands the Indians were overworked and finally exterminated.

On the continent, though Indians at first were forced to work in mines and were otherwise cruelly exploited, their condition

gradually improved, thanks to the missionaries and to royal intervention. Freed from slavery and serfdom, they were allowed to sell their labor as they pleased. Nevertheless, under Spanish and Portuguese rule, the Indians remained subject to tribute and in perpetual tutelage. They were compelled to cultivate the land and work the mines, and they were strictly supervised by friars and priests. Their numbers decreased, but they were by no means exterminated, and the population of Mexico and Peru and of several other countries of Spanish America is still chiefly Indian in blood.

English, French, and Dutch in America. — In the seventeenth century, France, England, and the Dutch Netherlands (Holland) shared with Spain and Portugal the exploration, conquest, and colonization of the New World.

French colonists settled in Acadia (now called Nova Scotia) in 1604 and at Quebec in 1608, and subsequently appropriated the region of the Great Lakes and the whole Mississippi Valley. Englishmen settled in Virginia in 1607 and at Plymouth (Massachusetts) in 1620. The Dutch founded the colony of New Amsterdam at the mouth of the Hudson River in 1623. Through further colonization and as an outcome of wars between the English and the Dutch, England at the close of the seventeenth century was mistress of the Atlantic coast of North America from Maine to Carolina; and England, Holland, and France had taken from Spain certain islands in the Caribbean.

At that time the two American Continents were being rapidly partitioned among Christian States of Europe; they were being Europeanized; and on their soil were arising a New Spain, a New Portugal, a New France, a New England, and a New Netherlands.

The Dark Continent. — Africa was much less affected than America, or even Asia, by European expansion. Its coasts were charted, and here and there a trading post was planted. European travellers penetrated to the Christian kingdom of Abyssinia and gave it minor assistance in its wars with neighboring Moslems. In the extreme northwest, Spaniards and Portuguese made temporary conquests at the expense of the Moslem Moors. At the extreme south the Portuguese established a trading post which was

captured by the Dutch and transformed by the latter into a small colony. But Africa as a whole remained a "Dark Continent," an unexplored wilderness. Its climate seemed unbearable, its Negro population largely barbarous, and its deserts and jungles quite impenetrable.

African Slave Trade. — Slavery had disappeared from Western Europe long before, but European colonists in America now demanded cheap labor for extensive agriculture, and the necessary supply was provided by the enslavement and forced labor of African Negroes. Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch, or English slave-dealers would install themselves at trading posts on the African coast and would employ Negroes who lived on the coast to make raids upon other Negroes in the interior, capture them, and turn them over to dealers. Then the dealers would transport the captured Negroes to America and sell them to the colonists. In this way a terrible but prosperous trade grew up. Hundreds of thousands of Negroes were forcibly transplanted from Africa to America. Though in the course of time their descendants have been freed and largely civilized and Christianized, the resulting race-problems of the present day in America are an unfortunate and abiding effect of European expansion in the fifteenth and sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Effects on Europe

1. **Progress Stimulated.** — Distant explorations and discoveries had far-reaching effects upon Europe. First, they ended its isolation and brought it into contact with the rest of the world. Its peoples were acquainted thereby with so many strange races and religions and customs, so many varieties of plants, so many unfamiliar animals, that they took new interest in the comparison and study of the different races of men and their customs and of the different species of animals and plants. Both the sciences and the arts of Europe were profoundly affected and stimulated.

2. **European Civilization Expanded.** — European civilization was greatly expanded by Russian colonization of Siberia and by Portuguese, Spanish, Dutch, French, and English conquests and colonization in America, Africa, and Asia.

3. European Emigration. — European emigration, beginning slightly during the Crusades, reached unheard-of proportions after the discovery of the New World. As new and productive lands were opened up, they were occupied by the surplus population of Europe, with the result that the economic condition of those who stayed at home, as well as of those who went abroad, was bettered. The number of persons of European stock and European language rapidly increased, and Europeans became the world's colonists and travellers and traders.

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

A PERSIAN KING OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY
Taking refreshments with one of his wives. From a painting in miniature.

4. Trade and Industry Promoted. — Commerce underwent a remarkable change, as regards both the quantity and the kind of goods carried. Now that they were making voyages across the Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian Oceans, instead of on the Mediterranean Sea, Europeans built larger and stronger ships. Since transportation by water was generally cheaper than by the old land-routes,

heavier and bulkier goods, such as timber, grain, and livestock, could be carried greater distances. Many new products gradually came into use in Europe, such as coffee, tea, cocoa, chocolate, cane sugar, molasses, rum (made from molasses), potatoes, maize ("Indian corn"), rice, and whale oil. Large quantities of fur, fish, and timber were shipped from America to Europe. Since there were now so many new and important products in addition to the older ones, trade branched out and expanded marvelously. And since the newly discovered lands and newly founded colonies had chiefly raw materials to send to Europe, and needed to import manufactures rather than food, European countries began to make larger quantities of manufactured goods for export.

5. **Wealth and Luxury Increased.** — The expansion of commerce brought wealth to European merchants, manufacturers, and bankers. Many Europeans enriched themselves from overseas plunder and robbery, from piracy, from unequal trade with unsuspecting natives, and from the forced labor of Indians and Negroes. And with greater wealth there was greater luxury. The goods of every continent were brought for the enjoyment of the European who could afford them — Persian rugs for his floor, Chinese silks and Indian cottons and American furs for his wardrobe, gold from Africa and precious stones from South America and the Far East for his adornment, Indian ebony for his table, Mexican silver for his knife, coffee from Brazil and Arabia, sweetened with sugar from Cuba.

6. **Rise of Middle Class and Capitalism.** — The class in European society which profited most from the amazing growth of commerce was the middle class, the dwellers in towns, the bourgeoisie; and as a result of the remarkable enrichment of the middle class, the gild system of the European Middle Age was transformed into the capitalism of the modern world. The rise of the middle class and the growth of capitalism constitute central facts in modern history and modern civilization.

7. **Commercial and Colonial Wars.** — Another characteristic of modern Europe and of the modern world has been the frequency of commercial and colonial wars. These date, in acute form,

from the distant explorations and discoveries of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. We shall here endeavor to explain briefly their origin and nature.

National States in Competition. — The discoveries resulted in the strengthening of National States in western Europe at the expense of city-states, and in the substitution of commercial scrambles among great nations for the earlier trade conflicts among cities. It was not the Italian city-states or the German city-states or the Flemish city-states which sponsored the long voyages that brought Europeans to Asia and Africa; it was the rising National States of the Atlantic seaboard — Portugal, Spain, France, England, and Holland (the Dutch Netherlands) — and these nations reaped the reward and paid a price. The commerce and wealth and political prestige of Venice and Genoa and of the Hanseatic League declined; the influence and power of the National States increased. But just as Genoa and Venice had vied with each other in cornering the trade of the Mediterranean, so each of the National States now sought by force to monopolize the commerce of the world or as much of it as possible.

Papal Line of Demarcation. — The first significant discoveries were made, as we have seen, by Portugal and Spain. After some quarrelling and fighting between them, Pope Alexander VI in 1493 issued a famous decree (called a "bull"), dividing the world into two hemispheres by a line drawn from the North Pole to the South Pole, one hundred leagues west of the Azores, and assigning the western hemisphere to Spain, and the non-Christian parts of the eastern hemisphere to Portugal. A year later this "papal line of demarcation" was shifted by mutual consent to about 360 leagues west of the Cape Verde Islands, thereby giving Portugal title not only to Africa and Asia but also to eastern South America (Brazil). Both nations attempted to monopolize all trade within their respective hemispheres and to prevent other nations from carrying on overseas commerce and colonization. Even between Spain and Portugal there were trade jealousies and rivalries, and the Spanish occupation of the Philippines was a forceful poaching on Portuguese preserves.

But other nations, particularly the English, French, and Dutch,

COLONIAL EMPIRES

20°
40°
60°
80°
100°
120°
140°
160°
180°
80°
60°
40°
20°
0°
20°
40°
60°
ARCTIC CIRCLE
S I B E R I A
(Colonized by Russians before 1700)
RUSSIA
A S I A
PERSIA
Nanking
CHINA
P A C I F I C
O C E A N
TROPIC OF CANCER
ARABIA
Surat
INDIA
Bombay
Goa
Calicut
Madras
CEYLON
PHILIPPINE IS.
SPICE IS.
EQUATOR
EAST INDIES
Malindi
INDIAN
OCEAN
MADAGASCAR
AUSTRALIA
TROPIC OF CAPRICORN
Cape Town (Dutch)
Cape of Good Hope
NEW ZEALAND
20°
40° Longitude 60° East 80° from 100° Greenwich 120°
140°
160°
180°

BOUT 1700 A.D.

disregarded the papal line of demarcation altogether and opposed, wherever they could, the efforts of Spain and Portugal to close the oceans and foreign continents to them; they resorted to piracy, smuggling, and open war. And when, in 1580, the union of Spain and Portugal under the same King (Philip II of Spain) threatened to create a single exclusive monopoly of the commerce of the whole colonial world, the Dutch, English, and French redoubled their attacks.[1]

Dutch Seizure of Portuguese Colonies. — The Dutch, over whom Philip II also ruled, rose in rebellion. They assailed his holdings in other Continents and on the high seas. They captured hundreds of Spanish ships; they conquered several Spanish islands in the Caribbean Sea; they seized Portuguese forts and trading posts in India, the Malay archipelago, and South Africa; they secured a share of the commerce of China; and they assisted in driving the Portuguese from Japan. By the time their independence was officially recognized (1648), the Dutch had won a large colonial empire at the expense of Portugal and Spain, and had obtained a large part of the valuable trade between Europe and the Far East. In 1640 Portugal regained its independence of Spain, but most of its former colonies were retained by Holland.

Wars between Rival Colonial Empires. — Likewise, both the French and the English fought against Philip II of Spain and acquired trading posts and settlements in North America, in the Caribbean Islands, in India, and on the coasts of Africa. The merchants and governments and warships of England, France, and Holland thus made extensive inroads, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, into the possessions and claims of Spain and Portugal. But the newcomers were just as determined to establish and maintain monopoly of trade and colonization as were Spain and Portugal. The outcome was a terrible and protracted series of commercial and colonial wars, which became merged, at least in part, with the contemporary dynastic and autocratic wars on the Continent of Europe and which lasted throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

[1] See pp. 735, 739–740, 801–802.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. State the general causes or conditions which made Europe, rather than Asia or Africa, the center from which the great explorers of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were sent out.

2. What part did the Arabs take in world commerce during the Middle Age and the Era of Transition?

3. Trace on the map the chief routes of medieval commerce, especially of the commerce between Europe and the East. Why did these routes become unsatisfactory?

4. Describe the travels of Christian missionaries and merchants to China in the Middle Age, and their influence upon China. What effect did the Ming Revolution have on contact between China and Europe?

5. Trace the rise of the Portuguese colonial empire, with special reference to the achievements of Prince Henry the Navigator, Vasco da Gama, Cabral.

6. Why was the first voyage of Columbus of great historic importance?

7. What part did France and England take in the exploration of America?

8. Describe the activities of the Portuguese in India. What became of the Portuguese possessions in India and in the East Indies?

9. What effects did the coming of the Portuguese, and of the Dutch, French, and English, have on India?

10. In what ways, and to what extent, did Europe influence China and Japan during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries?

11. What is the prevailing language in the Philippine Islands? The prevailing religion? Give an historical explanation of your answer.

12. Describe the conquests of Cortez and Pizarro. Trace the extent of the Spanish possessions in America about the middle of the seventeenth century. Discuss Spanish colonial policy, with special reference to the treatment of the natives in the colonies.

SPECIAL TOPICS

Medieval knowledge of the world. CHEYNEY, *European Background*, ch. iii; SYNGE, *Book of Discovery*, ch. xix.

Old trade routes and the Turks. CHEYNEY, *European Background*, ch. ii; HAYES, *Modern Europe*, I, 43–49; 52–53.

Viking explorers. SYNGE, *Book of Discovery*, ch. xiv; BEAZLEY, *Dawn of Modern Geography*, II, 17–111; GATHORNE-HARDY, *Norse Discoverers of America*.

Marco Polo. SYNGE, *Book of Discovery*, ch. xvii; C. R. BEAZLEY, "Marco Polo and the European Expansion," in *Atlantic Monthly*, CIV, 493–501; BEAZLEY, *Dawn of Modern Geography*, II, ch. vi.

Prince Henry the Navigator. CHEYNEY, *European Background*, ch. iv; ABBOTT, *Expansion of Europe*, 82–92; C. R. BEAZLEY, *Prince Henry the Navigator*.

Da Gama. SYNGE, *Book of Discovery*, ch. xxiv; JAYNE, *Vasco da Gama*.

Columbus. VAN LOON, *Story of Mankind*, 224–240; E. G. BOURNE, *Spain in America*, 8–32; HART, *American History Told by Contemporaries*, I, 28–48.

Magellan. SYNGE, *Book of Discovery*, ch. xxvii.

The Portuguese in India. SMITH, *Oxford History of India*, 330–336.

Spain in the Far East. GOWEN, *Asia*, ch. viii.

Cortez. HART, *American History Told by Contemporaries*, I, 49–53; BANCROFT, *Central America*, 522–643; W. H. PRESCOTT, *The Conquest of Mexico*, Books ii–iv.

Pizarro. HART, *American History Told by Contemporaries*, I, 53–57; PRESCOTT, *Conquest of Peru*, esp. I, 483–510.

The Mogul Empire. SMITH, *Oxford History of India*, 321–329, 343–373.

Japan's first contacts with Europe. LATOURETTE, *Development of Japan*, 54–78.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THE TEACHER

E. P. CHEYNEY, *European Background of American History*. W. C. ABBOTT, *Expansion of Europe*. C. R. BEAZLEY, *Dawn of Modern Geography*. G. M. GATHORNE-HARDY, *Norse Discoverers of America*. C. R. BEAZLEY, *Prince Henry the Navigator*. K. G. JAYNE, *Vasco da Gama and his Successors*. F. YOUNG, *Christopher Columbus*. JOHN FISKE, *Discovery of America*. H. W. VAN LOON, *Golden Book of the Dutch Navigators*. H. E. BOLTON AND T. M. MARSHALL, *Colonization of North America*. E. G. BOURNE, *Spain in America*. R. B. MERRIMAN, *Rise of the Spanish Empire*, II, III. A. G. KELLER, *Colonization*. A. H. LYBYER, "Ottoman Turks and the Routes of Oriental Trade," in *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXX, 577–588. E. CHANNING, *History of the United States*, I. H. H. JOHNSTON, *History of the Colonization of Africa*. F. C. DANVERS, *The Portuguese in India*. CAMBRIDGE MODERN HISTORY, I, ch. xv. HERRICK, *History of Commerce*. C. DAY, *History of Commerce*.

CONVENIENT SOURCE MATERIALS

A. B. HART, *American History Told by Contemporaries*, I. J. E. OLSON AND E. G. BOURNE, *The Northmen, Columbus, and Cabot* (Original Narratives of Early American History). THE BOOK OF MARCO POLO (Everyman's Library). E. ARBER (ed.), *Voyages and Travels*. A. PIGAFETTA (ed.), *Magellan's Voyage Around the World: the Original Text*. TRAVELS OF SIR JOHN MANDEVILLE (Macmillan ed.).

CHAPTER XXII

THE CLASSICAL REVIVAL AND THE INVENTION OF PRINTING

Rediscovery of Classical Civilization

Renewed Interest in Classical Civilization. — Western Europe in the fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth centuries not only made contacts with strange nations in distant places, but also renewed its contact with civilization of ancient times, especially with that of the Greeks and Romans. Indeed, among the educated people of central and western Europe the interest in the classical civilization of Greece and Rome equalled, and even surpassed, the interest in the contemporary civilizations of Asia and America.

Lasting Influence of Classical Civilization. — Despite many changes and developments in Europe during the thousand years from the fourth to the fourteenth century, Europeans always retained some contact with the classical civilization of ancient Greece and Rome. The ancient languages continued to be used in church services — Latin in the West, and Greek in the East. Ancient architecture continued to serve as a model for Romanesque church buildings. Many a written word continued to survive and many a monument of stone continued to stand as constant reminders to medieval Europeans of "the glory that was Greece and the grandeur that was Rome."

It is true that under Christian auspices much of the spirit of ancient civilization was altered, and certain novel features were added to European civilization. For example, such medieval developments as Gothic architecture, rhymed poetry, "romances," morality plays, stained glass, Christian painting and music, fantastic humor in sculpture, etc., were radically different from anything in pagan Græco-Roman civilization. But all the develop-

ments of the Middle Age were on top of and in addition to the classical elements which continued to exist and to influence Europe.

Classical Writers Valued in Middle Age. — Certain classical writers were widely known and cherished throughout the Middle Age — notably Virgil, Cæsar, and Cicero. Moreover, as we have pointed out elsewhere, both a revived study of Aristotle and a renewed study of the Roman law occupied central positions in the medieval universities and helped to produce the philosophy, the theology, and the canon law which were most characteristic of Christian learning and higher education. Aristotle was revered, almost as if he had been a Christian saint instead of a pagan philosopher. Then, too, most of the medieval ideas of astronomy, medicine, and chemistry were derived, directly or indirectly, from ancient sources. And from ancient sources, at least indirectly, and in part, were derived many of the medieval notions of history: the most popular "general histories" were books which had been compiled from the Old Testament of the Hebrews and from the histories of Greeks and Romans. In fine, the Europeans of the Middle Age were indebted in many, many ways to a much earlier, classical civilization, and they were aware of their debt.

A New View of the Classics. — Nevertheless, during the succeeding centuries of transition from the Middle Age to Modern Times, the centuries from the fourteenth to the seventeenth, the classical Græco-Roman civilization was rediscovered in a new way. Previously Christians had known something about classical literature, art, philosophy, and science, but they had applied their knowledge to practical purposes and had infused it with the spirit of Christianity. They had revered Virgil because he was supposed in his Æneid to prefigure the Christian Church and to inculcate many moral truths. They had adapted Græco-Roman architecture to the requirements of church-building. They had used Aristotle to construct their own scholastic theology and philosophy. They had found in ancient Greek and Roman writers many "scientific" speculations which appeared to be of practical value to themselves. Now, however, in the Age of Transition, Christians read the classics, not because they possessed religious or ethical significance

and not even because they supplied useful information, but rather because they were inherently interesting and enjoyable and because their form was delightful. In other words, Christians discovered something new about the ancient classics. They would forget all about religion, Christian or pagan, and would study the classics for the joy of the thing. They would enter sympathetically into the spirit of the original authors.

Meaning of the Classical Revival or Renaissance. — This is what is meant by the "Classical Revival," or (as it is sometimes termed) the "Renaissance."[1] It was basically the sympathetic study of the masterpieces of ancient Latin and Greek literature — the "classics."[2] But this led to an appreciation, amounting to enthusiastic veneration, of all forms of ancient civilization. Thereby the Classical Revival came to mean the widespread use of ancient models for contemporary art and science, and to represent, particularly in literature, architecture, painting, and sculpture, a reaction against the medieval culture of Western Europe.

Let us proceed now to a more detailed account of how the classics were revived and of what was rediscovered in them.

The Study of the Classics

Petrarch's Love of Latin Classics. — The first important advocate of the new way of studying and interpreting the ancient classics was an Italian, Francesco Petrarca (frän-chĕs′cō pā-trär′kä), or, as he is known to us, Petrarch (pē′trärk, 1304–1374).

[1] The word "Renaissance," meaning "rebirth," has frequently been employed to indicate all or most of the happenings during the centuries of transition from the Middle Age to Modern Times. In our opinion, such a use of the word is erroneous and misleading. There was manifestly no "rebirth" of ancient Greece or Rome in the later Crusades and the conquests of the Ottoman Turks, in the development of National States, in commercial and missionary undertakings of Europeans in distant Asia, Africa, and America, or in the invention of gunpowder, the mariner's compass, and printing. These things, which were characteristic of the Age of Transition, were no part of a "rebirth"; they were new-born. We do not object to the use of "Renaissance" to denote merely the Classical Revival, described in this chapter, and possibly the Rise of Autocracy, discussed in Chapter XX; but to avoid confusion and misunderstanding, we ourselves shall not employ the word "Renaissance."

[2] See p. 121.

Petrarch, after spending his boyhood in Tuscany and his young manhood in papal service at Avignon, devoted himself exclusively to a life of scholarship and the pursuit of literature. He wrote some popular poems in Italian,[1] but his hobby was the sympathetic and enthusiastic study of ancient Latin writings. He was not interested in trying to find moral truths in these books; he admired them and strove to imitate them because he thought them more charming in form and more delightful in subject matter than any strictly Christian literature. In a multitude of polished Latin epistles and in numerous Latin poems, as well as by daily example and precept, Petrarch preached the revival and imitation of the classics. Petrarch took himself very seriously, and so, in time, did others. He became tremendously influential. He was no local, or even national, figure. He was revered and respected by his contemporaries throughout Western Europe as "the scholar." The Pope supplied him with funds. Kings vied with one another in heaping benefits upon him. The Venetian Senate gave him the freedom of the city. Both the University of Paris and the city of Rome crowned him with laurel.

PETRARCH

Greek Teachers in Italy. — Petrarch's enthusiasm for ancient literature was fully shared by his fellow-countryman and contemporary, Boccaccio (bŏk-kä′chō); and during the next century most scholars in Western Europe, first in Italy and later in

[1] See p. 614.

other countries, followed in the footsteps of Boccaccio and Petrarch. Petrarch himself was a serious Latin scholar, but he had no profound knowledge of Greek. About the year 1400, however, as a consequence of Moslem Turkish pressure against the Byzantine Empire,[1] Greek scholars and teachers in considerable numbers left Constantinople and Greece, crossed the Adriatic, and settled in Italy. One of them, a certain Chrysoloras (krĭs′ō-lō′răs), opened an especially famous school of Greek studies at Florence and himself gave lectures on Homer to crowds of students.

Rediscovery of Old Books; Teaching of Classics. — Thenceforth the study of both Greek and Latin classics went on apace. Monasteries were ransacked for old manuscripts, and many long-lost or long-forgotten writings, including some books by Tacitus, Cicero, Quintilian, and Lucretius, were rediscovered. Libraries for the classics were built or enlarged. Formal instruction in the classics was given in schools and universities and soon surpassed in quantity and popularity the instruction in scholastic philosophy and theology. Classical study became not only the profession of scholars but also the fad of princes, and many a wealthy gentleman patronized and subsidized the "new learning."

Attitude of Clergy: Nicholas V and Leo X. — At first the study of the classics aroused misgiving and even opposition on the part of ardent clergymen, who feared that the pagan elements in the classics might exert an unwholesome influence upon Christianity. But gradually the "new learning" came to be tolerated, and then encouraged, and finally patronized by the papacy itself. Pope Nicholas V (1447–1455) was a conspicuous classical scholar and a liberal patron of others: he hired hundreds of persons to copy old manuscripts; he awarded a handsome prize for a metrical translation of Homer; and he collected at the Vatican a large classical library. Many of his successors were like-minded, and the revived appreciation of pagan civilization culminated at the opening of the sixteenth century in the reign of Pope Leo X. This Pope was a son of the celebrated Lorenzo de' Medici (styled Lorenzo the Magnificent), a wealthy banker and political "boss" of the city of Florence who wrote elegant Latin, subsidized scholars and artists, and

[1] See pp. 665–666.

established a magnificent library. Leo X himself was at once the patron and the exemplar of the "new learning": he thoroughly enjoyed the masterpieces of the ancient Greeks and Romans, and also he enjoyed music and the theater, the gay and the witty — life in every form.

The New Learning Spreads through Europe. — The zeal for classical studies reached its highest pitch in Italy in the first half of the sixteenth century, and already it was communicated to other countries. In France the "new learning" received encouragement from the Kings, particularly Francis I (1515–1547), who repeatedly intervened in the politics and wars of Italy and took back home with him scholars and artists and ancient masterpieces. In England it was championed, during the reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII, by the universities and by numerous clergymen and public officials, including the distinguished lawyer, Sir Thomas More, whose chief work, the "Utopia," was based on Plato's "Republic." At about the same time the "new learning" was taken up and diligently pursued in Germany, Spain, Scandinavia, and Poland.



ERASMUS
From a famous contemporary painting by Hans Holbein.

Erasmus. — The foremost classical scholar at the beginning of the sixteenth century was Erasmus (1469–1536). He was a native of Rotterdam in Holland, but during a long and studious life he travelled a good deal and lived at times in Germany, in France, in England, in Italy, and in Switzerland. He was trained in

theology and became a priest, but it was as a lover of the classics and as a prolific writer that he acquired his title to fame. Erasmus did not take himself so seriously as Petrarch, but to an even greater degree than Petrarch he was an outstanding international figure. He corresponded with every important writer of his generation, and he was on terms of personal friendship with Pope Leo X, with Emperor Charles V, with Francis I of France, and with Henry VIII of England. He prepared and published a scholarly Greek edition of the New Testament; and in his own writings — his "Praise of Folly," his "Adages" and "Colloquies" — which sparkled with quip and jest, he made fun of superstitions and prejudices, assailed ignorance, and lauded the classics and the life of classical scholarship.

Results of Classical Revival. — We may now summarize the results of the new study of the classics.

1. *Teaching of Classics.* — It added a new group of subjects to the curriculum of schools and colleges and universities; and from the fifteenth century to the present, the teaching of Latin and Greek, the teaching of Cæsar, Cicero, and Virgil, Xenophon and Homer, has occupied an honored place in education.

2. *Humanism.* — It produced "Humanism," the notion that the pagan classics are the finest and most perfect type of literature because they are peculiarly *human* and "overflowing with the joy of living." The "proper study of mankind," said the Humanists, is "man" — the human being rather than the Divine Being — and the chief studies of man, the chief "humanities," are to be found in ancient Greek and Latin literature.

3. *Reverence for Antiquity.* — It tended to glorify antiquity and to discount the culture of the Middle Age. Just as the Humanists imagined that the classics represented more human and more elegant forms of literature than medieval writings, so they naturally felt that ancient civilization in all respects must have been higher and better than that of the Middle Age. In this sense, the new study of the classics was reactionary: it involved a turning back of men's minds to earlier times. In the distant past of Greece and Rome, rather than in the recent past, were to be sought the models for art and science, for government and society, for diplomacy and war, for human conduct generally. Kings of

the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries derived their theories of autocracy not from the Middle Age but from antiquity. Machiavelli (mä′kyä-vĕl′lē) was moved by study of the classics to assert that princes were not bound in public affairs by the rules of private morality.[1] It became the fashion for parents to name their children, not after Christian saints, but after pagan celebrities — Cæsar, Cato, Virgil, Æneas, Plutarch, Homer, Solon, Pericles, Diana, Julia, Augusta, Lucretia, etc.

4. *Weakening of Christianity.* — Its effects upon Christianity were curious and contradictory. On the one hand, it enriched the culture of Christian peoples. Popes and other influential churchmen could see nothing incompatible between the proper practice of their religion and the proper pursuit of classical studies. And it is a significant fact that in the sixteenth century, when rebellion broke out in northern Europe against the Catholic Church, the foremost Humanists remained loyal to the Church and some of them (including Sir Thomas More) laid down their lives in its defense.

On the other hand, the new study of the classics had at least indirect effects which were at variance with traditional Christian morals and which weakened the Church. Humanism, in its extreme form, was hostile to self-sacrifice and self-denial, and under its influence some Christians (including bishops and even several Popes) became very worldly and indulged in personal enjoyments which most of us at the present time as well as most people in the Middle Age would deem un-Christian and vicious. Many Humanists belittled theology and assailed monasticism, and thereby they raised doubt in the popular mind about particular beliefs and practices of the Church. A few Humanists, from their study of the pagan classics, actually grew skeptical about the truth and value of Christianity itself.

5. *Indirect Stimulus to Vernacular Literatures.* — The new study of the classics indirectly gave a marked stimulus to contemporary vernacular literatures. It supplied them with a wealth of new materials, and at the same time it discouraged further use of contemporary spoken Latin for purposes of literary composition. The classical scholars were so intent upon trying to write Latin

[1] See pp. 684–685, 710.

precisely as Cæsar and Cicero wrote it, and so scornful of what they termed the "barbarous" Latin of later centuries, that many persons who were unable to write in the complicated dead Latin of the Augustan Age and who were afraid of being laughed at for writing in the simpler living Latin of the Middle Age, proceeded to express themselves in Italian, French, English, German, or some other vernacular. It is an interesting fact that the revival of classical Latin sounded the death-knell of Latin as a living international language.

6. *More Scientific Study of History.* — It promoted the scientific study of history. Hitherto, most history written by Christians had been written for Church purposes or had been strongly tinged with Christian faith and morality. In other words, most of it was "sacred history." Now, however, "profane history" came into greater vogue. Humanist historians, in their enthusiasm for antiquity, wrote about the distant past with greater sympathy and understanding, and with little or no attention to religion and morals; and even about more recent times they wrote as Humanists rather than as Christians. Besides, the search for ancient manuscripts and documents, and the comparison and editing of them, provided more copious and more reliable materials for the study of history and likewise developed the critical spirit, without which the writing of sound history is impossible.

7. *Advance in Art.* — The new study of the classics, by opening up the whole ancient civilization of the Greeks and Romans, inspired in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries a great and widespread movement toward the copying of classical forms and types of architecture, painting, and sculpture. Thus it produced a real and astounding advance in art, an advance which we shall discuss at some length in our next section. Thereafter, in the second section following, we shall see how and why the revival of the classics did not produce a corresponding advance in natural science.

Art and the Classical Revival

Art in Transition. — The most striking and permanent effects of the classical revival were in the fields of art — in literature, architecture, sculpture, and painting. In all these fields not only

were ancient masterpieces rediscovered and imitated, but important new works were produced, curiously combining pagan and Christian elements, and constituting an artistic link between Ancient Times and the Middle Age and likewise between the Middle Age and Modern Times.

Vogue of Imitative Latin Literature. — In the field of literature, there was a vast output of Latin writing, but it was very pedantic and imitative: it was not great or permanent. The important new works were in the vernacular languages, and they were produced largely in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. For a time, in the fifteenth century, the classical revival seemed to halt the development of vernacular literature. It will be recalled that in the Middle Age some great and beautiful literature had been written in Italian, French, Spanish, German, English, and other national languages.[1] But as the zeal and enthusiasm for ancient literature grew and became more widespread, a rapidly increasing number of scholars and literary men neglected their own national languages and devoted themselves exclusively to Greek and Latin. Petrarch wrote beautiful sonnets in Italian, but he was ashamed of them; his Latin letters were the writings of which he was proud and for which he was chiefly esteemed by contemporary scholars. Petrarch's immediate successors spent their lives searching for old manuscripts, editing the classics, or composing Latin epistles, orations, and epics in imitation of Horace, Cicero, or Virgil. Most of the Humanists thought classical Latin and Greek the only respectable literary languages; the contemporary vernaculars were beneath their notice. In the fifteenth century very little literature of a high order appeared in any of the vernaculars.

Vernacular Literature. — By the sixteenth century, however, a considerable number of literary geniuses refused longer to devote their efforts to mere imitation of ancient Greeks and Romans. And because they wished to write not for a relatively small number of scholars and critics but rather for the masses, they employed the vernacular languages and gave new fame and distinction to the vernacular literature. In a sense they revived and reinvigorated

[1] See pp. 612–615.

the literature of the Middle Age, but they did more: they incorporated in it many forms and materials which they had learned from their studies of pagan antiquity. They marked at once the last phase of ancient and medieval literature and the first phase of modern literature.

Italian and German Writers. — Inasmuch as the revived study of the classics was pursued with greatest zeal in Italy and Germany, these countries did not produce as great vernacular writers in the sixteenth century as did other countries. It was unfortunate, because some of the finest literature of the Middle Age had been in Italian or German. Nevertheless some literature of a high order was produced in the sixteenth century even in these languages. In Italian, Machiavelli wrote his "Prince" and his historical works — typical products of classical study and the pagan spirit. In Italian, too, Ariosto (ä′rē-ôs′tō) wrote his "Orlando Furioso," a highly imaginative poem of classical dignity. In Italian, likewise, Tasso (täs′sō) composed his "Jerusalem Delivered," a bulky epic, adapting the manner of the pagan Virgil to a Christian crusading subject. In the same century Martin Luther, by his translation of the Bible, made a monumental contribution to German literature.

Spanish, Portuguese, and French Literature. — Spanish (Castilian) literature was made resplendent at about the same time by a galaxy of geniuses. Cervantes (sĕr-văn′tēz), one of the greatest authors of all times, was steeped in classical studies, and in his immortal "Don Quixote" he poked fun at medieval feudalism and decadent chivalry. Lope de Vega (lō′pā dā vā′gä) and Calderon (käl′dä-rōn′) were also inspired by classical examples: the former composed some eighteen hundred dramas and really founded the Spanish theater; the latter wrote allegorical poems of unequalled merit.

Portuguese literature, too, reached its zenith in the "Lusiads" of Camoëns (kăm′ŏ-ĕns), a patriotic epic dealing with Vasco da Gama's wonderful explorations and exploits, which, as in Virgil's "Æneid," the pagan gods are represented as directing.

In French, another genius wrote — the sarcastic and clever Rabelais (rȧ′b'-lĕ′), more pagan than Christian, whose memorable

"Gargantua" comprised a series of daring fanciful tales, told with humor of a rather vulgar sort but with consummate art. It was under classical influences that French literature entered its "golden age" in the seventeenth century and was enriched by the masterpieces of Corneille (kôr′nā′y'), Racine (rȧ′sēn′), Moliere (mŏ′lyâr′), Madame de Sevigne (dē sā′vēn′yā′), and La Fontaine (lȧ fôɴ′tĕn′).

English Literature. — In England, from the appearance in 1551 of the English version of Sir Thomas More's "Utopia" to the publication of Milton's grandiose epic, "Paradise Lost," in 1667, there was a continuous outpouring of great literature. There were Cranmer's "Book of Common Prayer" and the King James translation of the Bible; Edmund Spenser's graceful "Faërie Queene"; the plays of Ben Jonson and Christopher Marlowe; the essays of Francis Bacon; and the dramas of the supreme Shakespeare (1564–1616). Most of these writers showed the influence of the classics and of Humanism either in subject-matter or in form. Several of Shakespeare's plays, it will be remembered, are based on episodes in ancient Greek and Roman history; the names of many of his characters are Italian, and many of his scenes are laid in Italy.

Renaissance Architecture. — Under the influence of the classical revival, Christian architecture underwent a veritable revolution and a remarkable development. The straight and severely plain line of the ancient Greek temple or the elegant gentle curve of the Roman dome was substituted for the fanciful lofty Gothic. A rounded arch replaced the pointed. Flying buttresses were discarded. And the ancient Greek orders — Doric, Ionic, and Corinthian[1] — were dragged from oblivion to embellish the simple symmetrical structures. The resulting "classical" or "renaissance" architecture was used for all manner of buildings, reaching perhaps its highest expression in the vast basilica of St. Peter, which was erected at Rome in the sixteenth century under the personal direction of such great artists as Raphael and Michelangelo.

The revival of Greek and Roman architecture, like the revival of Greek and Latin literature, had its origin in Italy; and in the cities of the peninsula, under the patronage of wealthy princes and noble families, it attained its most general acceptance. But it

[1] See pp. 213–214.

spread, like literary Humanism, to other countries, which in turn it deeply affected. More and more, throughout Western Europe, Gothic architecture was looked upon as barbarous; it went out of fashion, and newer buildings were erected in the classical style.

In France the Kings, especially Francis I, who led armies into Italy, took back home with them not only a great admiration for

THE BASILICA OF SAINT PETER AT ROME

the new buildings but also great numbers of Italian architects and builders. And before long the classical style appeared in many public structures in France, of which the celebrated palace of the Louvre, rebuilt by Francis I and his successors and to-day the home of one of the world's largest art collections, is a conspicuous example.

In the second half of the sixteenth century, the classical architecture similarly entered Spain and received encouragement from Philip II. About the same time it manifested itself in the Netherlands and in Germany. In England its appearance hardly took

place in the sixteenth century. It was not until 1619 that a famous architect, Inigo Jones, designed and reared the classical banqueting house in Whitehall, and not until the second half of the seventeenth century did Sir Christopher Wren, by means of the majestic St. Paul's Cathedral in London, render the new architecture popular in England.

THE CATHEDRAL OF SAINT PAUL AT LONDON

Classical Ideals in Sculpture. — Sculpture is usually an attendant of architecture, and it is not surprising, therefore, that transformation of the one should be associated with change in the other. The new movement showed itself in Italian sculpture as early as the fourteenth century, owing to the influence of the ancient monuments which still abounded throughout the peninsula and to which the Humanists directed attention. In the fifteenth century archæological discoveries were made and a special interest fostered by the Florentine family of the Medici, who not only

became enthusiastic collectors of ancient works of art but promoted the scientific study of sculpture. Sculptors followed more and more closely the Greek and Roman traditions in form, and often in subject as well. The plastic art of Italy in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries was strikingly akin to that of Athens in the fifth and fourth centuries before Christ.

The first great apostle of the new sculpture in the fifteenth century was Ghiberti (gē-bĕr′tē), whose marvellous doors on the baptistery at Florence were pronounced "worthy of being placed at the entrance of paradise." Slightly younger than Ghiberti was Donatello (dŏn′ä-tĕl′lō), who, among other achievements, fashioned the realistic statue of St. Mark in Venice. Della Robbia (dĕl′lä rŏb′byä), famed for his classical purity and simplicity of style, founded a school of sculptors in glazed terra-cotta. Michelangelo (mī′kĕl-ăn′jē-lō) himself was as celebrated for his sculpture as for his painting or his architecture: the heroic head of his "David" at Florence is a masterpiece of classical dignity. The style of the new sculpture was frankly classical, and its subjects were increasingly borrowed from pagan literature. Monuments were erected to illustrious men of ancient Rome, and Greek mythology was once more carved in stone.

The extension of classical sculpture beyond Italy was even more rapid than the spread of classical architecture. Italian sculptors were invited to England by Henry VII, and to France by Francis I. In Spain the tomb of Ferdinand and Isabella was carved and chiselled in classical style. Indeed, the new sculpture was to be found everywhere in Western Europe in the sixteenth century.

Progress in Painting. — Painting underwent an even more significant development than sculpture. Prior to the sixteenth century, most pictures were painted directly upon the plaster walls of churches or dwellings, and were called frescoes, although a few were executed on wooden panels. In the sixteenth century, however, easel painting — that is, detached pictures on canvas, wood, or other material — became common, and the use of oils was mastered. With these new methods, the art of painting was perfected.

In painting, progress was not so much the result of an imitation of classical models as was the case with sculpture and architecture,

Mona Lisa (La Gioconda), by Leonardo da Vinci

One of the most famous portraits in the world Leonardo worked on it for four years (1500–1504). "The eyes, the nose, the mouth, the lips, and the carnation of the cheek do not appear to have been painted, but to be truly flesh and blood." This celebrated painting is in the Louvre at Paris.

for the reason that painting, being one of the most perishable of the arts, had preserved few of its ancient Greek or Roman examples. But the artists who were interested in architecture and sculpture were naturally interested also in painting; and painting, bound by fewer antique traditions, remained more distinctively Christian and reached a higher degree of perfection than did any of the allied arts.

In Italy, in the sixteenth century, flourished four of the world's greatest painters — Leonardo da Vinci (lā′ō-när′dō dä vēn′chē), Michelangelo, Raphael (răf′ā-ĕl), and Titian (tĭsh′ăn). The former two acquired fame as great in architecture and in sculpture as in painting; the latter two were primarily painters.

Leonardo da Vinci. — Leonardo da Vinci (1452–1519), a Florentine by birth and training, was patronized in turn by the Sforza family of Milan, by the Medici of Florence, and by the French royal house. His great paintings — the Holy Supper and Mona Lisa (also called La Gioconda) — were masterful in art of composition and in science of light and shade and color. Leonardo, in fact, was a scientific painter; he carefully studied the human body and the problems of perspective. He was also a remarkable sculptor. As an engineer, too, he built a canal in northern Italy and constructed fortifications about Milan. He was a musician and a philosopher as well. This many-sided man liked to toy with mechanical devices. One day when the King of France visited Milan, he was met by a large mechanical lion that roared and then reared itself upon its haunches, displaying upon its breast the coat-of-arms of France: it was the work of Leonardo da Vinci. Leonardo influenced his age perhaps more than any other artist. He wrote extensively. He gathered about himself a large group of disciples. And in his last years, which he spent in France as a pensioner of Francis I, he encouraged painting in that country as in Italy.

Michelangelo. — Michelangelo (1475–1564), a Florentine like Leonardo, was probably the most wonderful of these artists because of his triumphs in a vast variety of endeavors. It might almost be said of him that "jack of all trades, he was master of all." He was a painter of the first rank, an incomparable sculptor, a

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

INTERIOR OF THE SISTINE CHAPEL

The famous chapel in the Vatican, built for Pope Sixtus IV in the fifteenth century and decorated with the matchless paintings of Michelangelo. The great fresco above the altar depicts the Last Judgment.

great architect, an eminent engineer, a charming poet, and a profound student of anatomy and physiology. Dividing his time between Florence and Rome, he served the Medici family and a succession of art-loving Popes. With his other qualities of genius, he combined austerity in morals, uprightness of character, a lively patriotism for his native city and people, a shrewd business-sense, and a proud independence. To give any adequate idea of his accomplishments is impossible here. The tomb of Pope Julius II in Rome and the colossal statue of David in Florence are examples of his sculpture; the basilica of St. Peter, which he practically completed, is his most enduring monument; the ceiling frescoes in the Sistine chapel in the papal palace of the Vatican, telling on a grandiose scale the Biblical story from Creation to the Flood, are marvels of his design and execution; and his grand fresco of the Last Judgment is probably the most famous single painting in the world.

Raphael. — Raphael (1483–1520) surpassed even Michelangelo in harmonious beauty of painting. For sheer charm, the "divine" Raphael stands without a peer. Raphael lived the better part of his life at Rome in the service of Popes Julius II and Leo X and spent several years in decorating the Vatican. Although he was, for a time, architect of St. Peter's basilica and although he displayed some aptitude for sculpture and for the scholarly study of ancient art, it is as the greatest of sixteenth-century painters that he earned his fame. Raphael lived fortunately, always in favor and rich, and bearing himself like a prince.

Titian. — Titian (1477–1576) was the typical representative of the so-called Venetian school of painting which acquired great distinction in bright coloring. Official painter for the city of Venice and patronized both by the Emperor Charles V and by Philip II of Spain, he secured considerable wealth and fame. He was not a man of universal genius like Leonardo da Vinci or Michelangelo; his one and supreme endowment was that of oil painting. In light and coloring, his work has never been surpassed.

Painting in Other Countries. — From Italy as a center, the new painting became the heritage of all Western Europe. Italian painters were brought to France by Francis I, and French painters

were paid to learn from them and to imitate them. Philip II of Spain proved himself a liberal patron of painting in his extensive dominions, and his successors gave employment to such distinguished painters as Rubens (rōō′bĕnz) and Van Dyck (văn dĭk′) in the Netherlands and Velasquez (vā-läs′kāth) and Murillo (mōō-rēl′yō) in Spain itself.



An Example of Raphael's Art

"Saint George and the Dragon," a painting by Raphael in 1504. See also the illustration facing p. 787.

In Germany, the best painting was exemplified by Albrecht Dürer (dürēr), a native of Nuremberg, who received his inspiration from Italian work and was royally patronized by the Emperor Maximilian. The career of Dürer was honored and fortunate: he was on friendly terms with all the masters of his age; he even visited Erasmus and painted his portrait. But it was as an engraver and woodcarver, rather than as a painter, that Dürer's reputation was earned. His greatest engravings, such as "The Knights and Death" and "St. Jerome in His Study," set a standard for all later engravers.

Painting, throughout its "golden age" of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, was overwhelmingly Christian in subject matter. But it could hardly have reached the perfection it did, had there been no contemporary Classical Revival and no contemporary Humanism. It was much the same with music.

Music. — Music, as far as Western Europe is concerned, began its "golden age" in the sixteenth century. It was then that the crude musical instruments of the Middle Age were much improved. The rebeck, to whose loud and harsh strains the medieval rustic had danced, was transformed, by the addition of a fourth string and a slight change of shape, into the sweet-toned violin. And as the forerunner of our modern piano, appeared the harpsichord with a keyboard carried to four octaves and the strings of each note doubled or quadrupled so as to give better and more prolonged tones. In the sixteenth century there appeared a great master-composer, Palestrina (pä′lās-trē′nä), who was organist and choir-master for the Pope, and is justly esteemed as the father of modern music. He directly influenced much of the Italian music of the seventeenth century and the magnificent classical German productions of the eighteenth century.

Science and the Classical Revival

Humanists Not Interested in Hellenistic Science. — In general, the natural sciences were retarded, rather than advanced, by the Classical Revival. The Classical Revival meant, as we have seen, that educated Europeans became enthusiastic about the Greek art and literature of the Age of Pericles and the Roman literature of the "Augustan Age." Neither of these "classical" ages had much to teach in scientific matters. On the other hand, the scientific works written by Alexandrian scholars in the Hellenistic Age[1] were considered less purely classical in literary style, and were generally ignored by European Humanists of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

Science in the Middle Age. — In science, indeed, Western Europe of the Middle Age was in advance of ancient Greece and Rome. Medieval Christians had learned not only most of what ancient Greeks and Romans had to teach but also what contemporary Arabs could impart. It is true that many theories were accepted in the Middle Age as "scientific" which to-day we would consider silly or preposterous; but it is also true that many ancient "scientific" theories and explanations were even sillier

[1] See pp. 235–237.

and more preposterous. Some medieval scholars, such as Roger Bacon and certain others, went much farther than any ancient had gone in stressing the importance of natural science and in insisting that observation and experiment are the only methods by which we can establish scientific truth.[1]

Attitude of Humanists. — But after the Middle Age came the Age of Transition, which was the age of the Classical Revival. The majority of learned men now turned from observation of the world in which they lived, as well as from speculation about the other world in which they might spend eternity, to study of the literature and art of an ancient and perished world. And by most of these learned men, these Humanists, it came to be believed, almost as a dogma, that the ancient Greeks and Romans had said and done everything which was worthy of ever being said or done. If the ancients had said relatively little about science, then science could not be very important; it was enough to follow their lead in language, literature, and the arts. If the ancients had written at all about science, then what they had said must be true; it was not necessary to look or think farther. Obviously such an attitude of mind was not conducive to experiment and independent study or to any noteworthy advance in natural science. The Middle Age was scoffed at. Roger Bacon was forgotten.

Scientific Method Urged by Bacon and Descartes. — It was not until the seventeenth century, when the Classical Revival was waning, that the scientific method championed by Roger Bacon in the thirteenth century was set forth anew and rendered fruitful by two eminent scholars — Francis Bacon and Descartes.

Francis Bacon, known as Lord Bacon, was a famous English lawyer and judge, who wrote many brief but brilliant essays and several longer works on philosophy and science such as the "Advancement of Learning" (1604) and the "Novum Organum" (1620). He insisted that a person should not say a thing is true just because some one else has said so, but only because the person has observed it with his own eyes.

Descartes (dā′kärt′) was a Frenchman, a curiously restless man, who travelled all about Europe, serving as a soldier in the Nether-

[1] See pp. 633–634.

lands, in Germany, and in Hungary, living for a time in Holland, and dying in Sweden, and with a mind as restless as his body. Now interested in mathematics, now in philosophy, presently absorbed in physics or chemistry or in the proof of man's existence, throughout his varied career he held fast to the conviction that science depends not upon the authority of ancient books but upon the observation of facts. "Here are my books," he told a visitor, as he pointed to a basket of rabbits that he was about to dissect.



DESCARTES

Scientific Advance in Spite of Classicism. — Certain scientific advances were made during the Age of Transition, but most of them were made in spite of the Classical Revival and not because of it. For example, the marvellous discoveries and explorations in Asia, Africa, and America very greatly increased the knowledge of European peoples concerning other peoples and other lands and provided a mass of material for later scientific study and investigation; but the distant discoveries and explorations and the resulting acquisition of scientific information were actuated not by the Classical Revival but by the economic ambition of contemporary business-men and by the zeal of Christian missionaries. Again, the invention of printing, which occurred, as we shall presently see, during this era, and which had profound scientific consequences, was not inspired by the Classical Revival: the ancient Greeks and Romans had no printing that could be revived.

Astrology and Superstition. — As a matter of fact, the Classical Revival served to confirm and strengthen the worst features of medieval science and to minimize its best features. Roger Bacon was ignored and forgotten. But astrology, of the most superstitious sort, flourished as never before. The Emperor Charles V and the French King Francis I, rivals in war and in the patronage of the "new learning" and the "new art," vied with each other in seeking guidance from astrologers, and most of the other autocrats of their day were continually consulting horoscopes. In physics and chemistry, likewise, the Classical Revival sanctified all the prejudices and superstitions of the ancients.

King Francis I of France
From the contemporary portrait by Clouet in the Louvre at Paris.

Progress in Astronomy. — The Classical Revival did make distinct and valuable contributions to the development of history as a science. These contributions we have already pointed out.[1] The only other important contribution which it made to science was in the domain of astronomy.

During the Middle Age, astronomers (and astrologers) had clung to the theory of a Greek philosopher of the second century A.D., named Ptolemy,[2] that the Earth is the center of the universe, that the Moon, Mercury, Venus, the other planets, the Sun, and the stars revolve about the Earth, and that the entire heavens are turned with incredible velocity completely around every twenty-four hours. This so-called "Ptolemaic system of astronomy" fitted in nicely with the language of the Bible and with the popular

[1] See p. 760. [2] See p. 372.

notion that the Earth remains stationary while the heavenly bodies rise and set. It was natural that for many centuries Christians should accept the explanation of Ptolemy as almost divinely inspired. However, Ptolemy's was not the only explanation which had been propounded by ancient Greek astronomers; and, with the revival of Greek studies in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, these other explanations were revived and discussed. One of them was appropriated by Copernicus (kŏ-pûr′nĭ-kŭs).

Copernicus. — Copernicus was a native of Poland, who divided his time between official work as a clergyman and private study of the classics and of astronomy. It was during a ten-year sojourn in Italy, studying canon law and medicine and familiarizing himself with the Greek classics, that Copernicus was led seriously to question the Ptolemaic system of astronomy and to cast about in search of a more convincing substitute. Thenceforth for many years he studied and reflected, but it was not until the year of his death (1543) that his results were published. His book — "On the Revolutions of the Celestial Bodies," dedicated to the Pope — presented the theory that the Earth is not the center of the universe but simply one of a number of planets which revolve about the Sun. The Earth seemed much less important in the Copernican system than in that of Ptolemy.

Kepler and Galileo. — The Copernican theory was supported and refined by two distinguished astronomers at the beginning of the seventeenth century — Kepler and Galileo; the one a German, the other an Italian.

Kepler, while he entertained many fantastic ideas about "the harmony of the spheres" and was not above telling fortunes for superstitious princes who would pay him well, made numerous important experiments and observations and established several of the fundamental laws of modern astronomy. It was Kepler who showed that the planets revolve about the Sun in elliptical rather than in strictly circular paths.

Galileo (gä′lē-lā′ō) popularized the Copernican theory. His charming lectures in the University of Padua were so largely attended that a hall seating two thousand had to be provided. In 1609 he perfected a telescope, which, although hardly more power-

ful than present-day opera glasses, enabled him to demonstrate that the Sun was turning on its axis, that the planet Jupiter was attended by revolving moons, and that the essential truth of the Copernican system was established. Galileo got into trouble with the Papal court and the Inquisition; and he was prohibited from further writing and lecturing. Galileo was a loyal Catholic and obeyed the prohibition, but had he lived another hundred years he would have rejoiced that almost all men of learning — Popes included — had come to accept his main conclusions.[1]

Thus the Classical Revival suggested to Copernicus a system of astronomy which, developed by Kepler and popularized by Galileo, exploded and supplanted the Ptolemaic system. It was one worth-while contribution which the Classical Revival made, in the field of science, to our modern civilization.

The Invention of Printing

Printing Invented in China. — Printing had been invented in China and used there and in Japan and Korea,[2] and doubtless European travellers and traders in the Far East in the fourteenth century saw or heard of printed books. Yet there is no proof that the art of printing was borrowed by Europe from Asia. Printing seems to have been independently invented in Western Europe. And it is with the invention of printing in Europe that we are here concerned.

No Printed Books in Europe before Fifteenth Century. — From earliest times up to less than five hundred years ago every book in Europe was laboriously written by hand. Although copyists acquired an astonishing swiftness in reproducing books, libraries of any size were the property exclusively of rich institutions or wealthy individuals. It was during the Age of Transition

[1] Better knowledge of astronomy made it possible for Pope Gregory XIII in 1582 to correct an error in the Julian calendar. (See note on p. 320.) Gregory moved the calendar back by ten days and ordered the extra leap-year day to be omitted on all centenary years (such as 1900) except those which are multiples of 400. The old Julian calendar, as reformed by Gregory, is called the Gregorian calendar. It is still our way of reckoning time.

[2] See pp. 402–403.

from the Middle Age to Modern Times — during the fifteenth century — that printing was invented.

Printing is an extremely complicated process, and it is hardly to be wondered at that centuries elapsed before its invention was complete. Among the most essential elements of the perfected

A Scribe Copying Books for a Library

process are *movable type*, with which the impression is made, and *paper*, on which it is made. Let us sketch the development of each of these elements.

Improvement of Paper. — For their writing the ancient Greeks and Romans had used papyrus, the prepared fiber of a tough reed which grew in the valley of the Nile; but papyrus, being very expensive and heavy, was not at all suitable for printing. Parchment (the dressed skins of certain animals, especially sheep), which was the standard material for the hand-written documents

of the Middle Age, was extremely durable; but, like papyrus, it was costly, unwieldy, and ill adapted for printing. The substance most useful for printing was paper, and paper appeared relatively late in Europe.

The earliest paper was probably that which the Chinese made from silk in the second century, A.D. Subsequently, Moslems appear to have borrowed the knowledge of paper from the Chinese and to have substituted cotton for silk. At any rate cotton paper was manufactured by Moslems at Damascus in the eighth century and this so-called Damascus paper was later imported into Greece and southern Italy and into Spain. In the latter country native-grown hemp and flax were again substituted for cotton. The resulting linen paper was used considerably in Castile in the thirteenth century and thence passed into France and all over Western Europe. Not until the fifteenth century was assured the triumph of paper, as distinct from papyrus or parchment, when printing, then on the threshold of its career, demanded a substance of moderate price which would easily receive the impression of movable type.

Invention of Movable Type. — The idea of movable type was derived from an older practice of carving whole words or even whole inscriptions upon blocks of wood, so that when they were inked and applied to writing material they would leave a clear impression. Medieval kings and princes frequently had their signatures cut on these blocks of wood or metal, in order to impress them on charters; and a kind of engraving was employed to reproduce pictures and written pages as early as the twelfth century.

It was a natural but slow evolution from block-impressing to the practice of casting individual letters in separate little pieces of wood or metal, all of the same height and thickness, and then arranging them in any desired order for printing. The great advantage of movable type over the blocks was the infinite variety of work which could be done simply by setting and re-setting the type.

The Inventor of Printing. — The actual history of the transition from the use of blocks to movable type — the real invention of printing — is unknown. It has been maintained that the first

European to make and use movable type was a certain Lourens Coster (kŏs′tēr), a native of the Dutch town of Haarlem (här′lĕm). All we positively know, however, is that about the year 1450 a man by the name of John Gutenberg (gōō′tĕn-berк) was employing movable type in a printing-shop in the German city of Mainz, and that the earliest-known products of the new art were papal "Letters of Indulgence" and a version of the Bible, both printed at Mainz by Gutenberg in 1454.

Rapid Development of Printing. — Slowly evolved, the marvellous art, after the middle of the fifteenth century, spread with almost lightning rapidity from Mainz throughout Germany, Italy, France, and England, indeed throughout all Western Europe. It was welcomed by scholars and applauded by the Church. Printing presses were erected at Rome in 1466, and book-publishing speedily became an honorable and profitable business in every large city. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, a famous and well-to-do scholar, Aldus Manutius (ăl′dŭs mȧ-nū′shĭ-ŭs), was operating in Venice the very celebrated Aldine press, whose beautiful editions of the Greek and Latin classics are still esteemed as masterpieces of the printer's art.

Styles of Type. — The early printers fashioned the characters of their type after the letters that the scribes had used in longhand writing. Different kinds of common handwriting gave rise, therefore, to such varieties of type as the heavy black-faced "Gothic" which prevailed in Germany, or to the several adaptations of the clear, neat Roman characters which predominated elsewhere in central and western Europe. The compressed "italic" type was devised in the Aldine press in Venice to enable the publisher to crowd more words on a page.

Effects of Invention of Printing. — A constant development and expansion of the new art characterized the sixteenth century, and at least three remarkable results became evident. (1) There was an almost incalculable increase in the supply of books. Under earlier conditions, a skilled and conscientious copyist might, by prodigious toil, produce two books in a year. Now, in a single year of the sixteenth century, some 24,000 copies of one of Erasmus's books were struck off by one printing press.

(2) This indirectly increased the demand for books. By lessening the price of books and by enabling a large number of middle-class persons, as well as nobles and princes, to possess private libraries, printing became a powerful means of diffusing knowledge and broadening education.

(3) A greater degree of accuracy was guaranteed by printing than by manual copying. Before the invention of printing, it was well-nigh impossible to find two copies of any work that were exactly alike. Now, the repeated proof-readings and the printing of an entire edition from the same type were safeguards against forgery and error.

An Early Printing-Press

From the title-page of one of the first printed editions of Cicero's Letters.

The invention of printing was undoubtedly one of the greatest achievements of man. It occurred, in Western Europe, in the fifteenth century, just when distant explorations were being undertaken, when autocracy was rising, and when the Classical Revival was at its height. The invention was an outgrowth of the Middle Age; but so far-reaching have been its results that it may be said to determine, more than any other one factor, the distinctive character and quality of modern civilization.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. What is meant by the "Classical Revival" or "Renaissance"? What was "humanism"?

2. Discuss the attitude of each of the following persons toward the classics: Petrarch, Nicholas V, Leo X, Francis I, Erasmus.

3. How did the Classical Revival affect the vernacular literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries? By way of illustration, you might look through the list of Shakespeare's plays, counting the number of plays dealing with classical or ancient history.

4. In what respects did Renaissance architecture differ from Gothic?

5. Mention four great painters of the sixteenth century and give a biographical sketch of each. By what persons or institutions were these painters patronized? As regards this last point, can you see any contrast between sixteenth-century and twentieth-century art?

6. What was the attitude of the Humanists toward natural science?

7. How did Descartes and Francis Bacon promote science?

8. Explain the difference between the Ptolemaic and the Copernican system of astronomy. How did the latter supplant the former?

9. Give an account of the invention of printing and explain how this invention affected the progress of knowledge, literature, and education.

SPECIAL TOPICS

Petrarch's love of the classics. Robinson and Rolfe, *Petrarch*, 227–293; Robinson, *Readings*, I, 524–531; Ogg, *Source Book*, 462–473.

Erasmus. Taylor, *Thought and Expression in the 16th Century*, I, 155–182; Preserved Smith, *Erasmus*.

Francis Bacon. Durant, *Story of Philosophy*, 117–160; Libby, *History of Science*, ch. v; Bacon, *The New Atlantis*.

Medicine and anatomy in the 16th century. Taylor, *Thought and Expression in the 16th Century*, II, 307–325.

Astronomy. Sedgwick and Tyler, *Short History of Science*, ch. x; Taylor, *Thought and Expression in the 16th Century*, II, 326–345.

Copernicus. Sedgwick and Tyler, *Short History of Science*, 191–203; Lodge, *Pioneers of Science*, 2–31.

Galileo. Libby, *History of Science*, 75–78; Lodge, *Pioneers of Science*, 80–107; Sedgwick and Tyler, *Short History of Science*, 217–226, 245–254.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THE TEACHER

Cambridge Modern History, I. L. Thorndike, *Medieval Europe*. H. O. Taylor, *Thought and Expression in the 16th Century*. Preserved Smith, *Age of the Reformation*. J. Burckhardt, *The Civilisation of the Renaissance in Italy*. R. A. Taylor, *Aspects of the Italian Renaissance*. J. H. Robinson and H. W. Rolfe, *Petrarch*. H. C. Hollway-Calthrop, *Petrarch, His Life and Times*. A. Tilley, *Dawn of the French Renaissance*. G. H. Putnam, *Books and Their Makers during the Middle Ages*. J. H. Randall, *Making of the Modern Mind*.

CONVENIENT SOURCE MATERIALS

J. H. Robinson, *Readings*. A. Macdonell (trans.), *Memoirs of Benvenuto Cellini*. Erasmus, *Praise of Folly*. Francis Bacon, *The New Atlantis* (and other works). Sir Thomas More, *Utopia*.

CHAPTER XXIII

THE BREAK IN THE CHURCH

Opposition to the Catholic Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries

Earlier Breaks in the Church. — From early times there had been differences of opinion among Christians, differences of opinion as to Church organization and doctrines. Heresies and schisms had arisen.

The earliest heresies, such as Arianism, though they flourished for a time, eventually died out and disappeared.[1] Other heresies resulted in the formation of separate national churches in Armenia, Mesopotamia, Egypt, and Abyssinia.

Even more serious was the schism in the eleventh century between Christians who used the Greek language and those who employed the Latin tongue: the former, claiming that they were peculiarly Orthodox, refused longer to acknowledge the authority of the Pope.[2]

Causes of the New Break. — In the sixteenth century, just when Western Europe was expanding overseas in America and Asia and Africa, another notable break occurred in the Church in Europe. A large number of Christians, mainly in northern Europe, rebelled against the organization and repudiated some of the doctrines of the Catholic Church and established "Protestant" Churches. This major break was an outcome of opposition which had appeared in the Middle Age and which particularly characterized the succeeding fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

1. *Political Opposition to Church.* — The opposition to the Catholic Church in Western Europe was of different kinds. One was the opposition of monarchs to the political power and

[1] See pp. 428–432. [2] See pp. 502–505.

influence of the Church. We have already seen how Holy Roman Emperors opposed the Papacy in the Middle Age, and also how national Kings in England, France, and Spain won the right to tax church property, to nominate Church officials, to limit the jurisdiction of Church courts, and to control the enforcement of papal decrees.[1] But conflict between Popes and Kings or Emperors was no new story in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and it alone could hardly suffice to cause a break in the Church.

2. *Religious Opposition: Lollards and Hussites.* — Another kind of opposition to the Church was opposition to its religious teachings. We have already mentioned the Albigensian heresy, which arose in southern France in the twelfth century, assailing the sacramental system and the priesthood of the Church, and which was suppressed in the thirteenth century.[2] In the fourteenth century, John Wycliffe (wĭk′lĭf, 1320–1384), an English priest and professor in the University of Oxford, made revolutionary attacks upon numerous Catholic dogmas and practices: he declared that the Pope was not Christ's representative on earth but an "anti-Christ," that monasticism was not a true part of Christianity, that the sacraments were without effect when administered by evil and wicked clergymen, that individual Christians should be guided entirely by what they read in the Bible, and that the Church should be subordinate to the State. Though condemned by the Pope, Wycliffe secured a large following in England among country gentlemen, politicians, and poor people, and after his death his writings were endorsed and spread in Bohemia (Czechoslovakia) by John Huss (1373–1415), a priest and professor in the University of Prague. Early in the fifteenth century the Lollards (as the English disciples of Wycliffe were called) and the Hussites were growing in numbers in England and Czechoslovakia.

But just as kings and princes had actively coöperated with the Catholic Church in suppressing the earlier Albigensian heresy, so now they sought to curb the Lollards and Hussites. The English Kings Henry IV and Henry V, by means of fines, imprisonments, and burnings, managed to stop the spread of the Lollard movement in their country. And the Holy Roman Emperor Sigismund,

[1] See pp. 575–577, 688–691, 694. [2] See pp. 568–570, 687.

anxious to get rid of the same heresy in Czechoslovakia, induced John Huss to attend a General Church Council at Constance and then, despite a solemn promise of personal safety which he had given Huss, he carried out the decree of the Council and had Huss burned at the stake (1415). The burning of Huss was speedily followed in Czechoslovakia by a popular insurrection, which was half religious and half patriotic. German Catholics made war on Czech Hussites, and the various sects into which the Hussite believers soon split made war on one another. These Hussite Wars lasted for several years, and eventually as an outcome of them and of special national concessions from the Pope, the Catholic Church was largely restored in Czechoslovakia. One Hussite sect, however, that of the "Moravian Brethren," has had a continuous existence from the fifteenth century to the present.

3. *Opposition to Certain Practices and Abuses.* — The third and most common kind of opposition to the Catholic Church in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was criticism of certain practices of clergymen and of what was termed the "corruption" of the Church. Some Catholics thought the clergy put too much emphasis upon external ceremonies, upon pilgrimages, upon the veneration of statues and relics of the saints, upon the use of indulgences, which tended, in their opinion, to obscure the mission of Christ and the Church and to promote superstition among the masses. This thought was especially voiced by Erasmus in his witty and celebrated "Praise of Folly." Erasmus felt that the Christianity of his day lacked some of its early spiritual force, and that to reform the Church it would be necessary to give the masses a better education, to hold monks and theologians in check, and to sweep away scandalous abuses.

Financial Abuses. — Abuses had developed rapidly during the fourteenth century, the century of the "Babylonian Exile" and "Great Schism";[1] and in the fifteenth century nearly all thoughtful Christians recognized the existence of very grave abuses in the Church. Scandals connected with the papal court at Rome became especially notorious in the second half of the fifteenth century. Popes then seemed to forget or neglect the duties of their universal

[1] See pp. 668–693.

spiritual office in efforts to enrich their families or to strengthen their own position as Italian princes. Simony (the sale of Church offices for money) and nepotism (favoritism shown by a Pope to his relatives) flourished anew. The best-paid Church offices throughout Western Europe were frequently conferred upon Italians who received the salary but did no work. A special Italian friend of the Pope might be made bishop of several dioceses and yet continue to reside in Rome. And at Rome many clergymen, including some of the Popes, lived in luxury and squandered vast sums of money upon worldly pleasures.

For example, Leo X (1513–1521) was a most distinguished advocate of Humanism and the "new learning" and a most liberal benefactor of Michelangelo and Raphael, and he was not personally immoral like Alexander VI, but he was too extravagant and too worldly to be an altogether worthy successor of the great Popes of the Middle Age. To obtain money for his luxurious tastes he created many new offices and shamelessly sold them; he increased the already burdensome Church taxes and collected large fees for indulgences; he pawned palace furniture, table silver, and even statues of the apostles. Several banking firms and many individual creditors were ruined by his death.

The immorality and worldliness which appeared at Rome were reflected in the lives of numerous lesser clergymen elsewhere. Many bishops and abbots, in wealth and behavior, were not unlike lay lords. Many of them were sons of noblemen and became officials of the Church so as to secure the means of gratifying their expensive tastes. Even monks and friars were sometimes of noble birth and quite worldly in their lives; they often dwelt now in rich monasteries as though they had never taken vows of poverty.

Demand for Reform. — There were grave abuses in the Church and there was a general demand for reform. And at times in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries it seemed as though the demand would be heeded and the abuses corrected. Some of the Popes of the period, and many cardinals and bishops and priests and monks, as well as many laymen, were sincere advocates of reform and strove earnestly to effect it. The spiritual mission of the

Raphael's Portrait of Leo X

This famous portrait of Leo X, who was Pope when Martin Luther broke with the Catholic Church, was painted by Raphael (1483–1520), the greatest of the great painters of his age. See page 770.

Church was by no means wholly neglected, and the fact that the most famous and popular book of Christian devotion, next to the Bible — the "Imitation of Christ" — was written by a Catholic monk, Thomas à Kempis, in the fifteenth century, indicates that the basic principles of Christianity were still widely taught and esteemed.

Summary of Conditions in 16th Century. — A reform of the Catholic Church was actually effected in the sixteenth century, but it was then too late to prevent a major break in the religious unity of Western Europe. By this time, political, economic, and patriotic opposition to the Church, together with opposition to some of its religious teachings, had merged and fused into open rebellion of princes and peoples. The rise of autocracy heightened the ambition of kings and princes to be autocrats in religion as well as in politics and to dominate the Church in their respective realms as they dominated the nobility, the parliaments, and the towns. The growing ambition for wealth on the part of noblemen and middle-class merchants created in them a desire to appropriate the extensive estates of the Church, to reduce the taxes paid to the Church, and to put a stop to the economic dictation of the Church. The development of national feeling, of national patriotism, gave popular strength to the agitation to free the Church in England, Germany, France, or elsewhere, from "foreign" rule and to transform the Catholic Church into a loose confederation of national churches. Against such tendencies of the sixteenth century, the Papacy and many individual Christians showed determined hostility. They were unwilling, as the price of preventing a break, to "nationalize" the Catholic Church, or to consent to the loss of its lands and revenues or to its complete subjection to autocratic monarchs.

Two Kinds of Reformers. — In the circumstances the Christian reformers of the sixteenth century divided into two camps: those who remained within the Catholic Church and respected its organization and its dogmas, while they labored to remedy abuses; and those who rebelled against its officials, repudiated some of its dogmas, and, separating themselves from the Catholic Church, proceeded to set up new and independent "reformed" churches.

This was the break in the Church. It meant that throughout Western Europe, in the sixteenth century, while the Catholic Church was being reformed from within, rival churches of protest — the so-called Protestant Churches — were coming into existence. The religious unity which had so long characterized western and central Europe was now broken.

Rise of Protestant Churches

Martin Luther, the German Reformer. — The first reformer who succeeded in influencing a very large number of persons in Western Europe to rebel openly against the Catholic Church was Martin Luther (1483–1546). Luther was a native of Germany, became a monk when he was twenty-two years of age, and shortly afterwards was appointed professor of theology in the University of Wittenberg. Here as teacher and preacher he was popular with students. He was recognized as a bold, outspoken clergyman, fearless in stating his own opinions. At the same time he seems to have worried a good deal about the salvation of his own soul, and gradually he became so convinced of his sinfulness and unworthiness that he came to doubt whether he (or anyone else) could *do* anything pleasing to God; the only hope of humanity was simple *faith* in God's mercy on the part of each individual.

Luther's Break with the Church. — Luther's actual break with the Catholic Church was gradual. In 1517 he first attracted national attention in Germany by questioning publicly and in writing the Catholic practice of "indulgences" and the doctrine of "good works" on which indulgences rested.[1] In the year 1517 several agents of Pope Leo X had been sent out to dispose of indulgences and collect money for the completion of St. Peter's Church in Rome. It was against the activities of one of these agents, Tetzel by name, in the archdiocese of Mainz, that Luther posted on the church-door in Wittenberg a series of "95 Theses" (assertions or propositions) in which Luther asserted, among other things, that "The Christian who has true repentance has already received pardon from God altogether apart from an indulgence, and does

[1] What an "indulgence" was (and is) has been explained above on p. 687.

Courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

MARTIN LUTHER

not need one." Two years later, in a public debate with a distinguished Catholic theologian, Luther denied that either a Pope or a Church Council possessed any divine authority to interpret Christ's teachings. Falling back upon the teachings of Huss and Wycliffe, he stoutly asserted the right of every individual to order his life in accordance with his own private reading of the Bible. In 1520 Pope Leo X excommunicated Luther and requested the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V to punish him as a heretic.

Luther under the Ban. — The Emperor perceived clearly that Luther's doctrines were revolutionary and that unless they were checked they would undermine the Catholic Church. Like all the medieval monarchs before him, Charles V felt that the maintenance of the Catholic Church was essential to the authority of the state as well as to the unity of Christendom. So the Emperor Charles V heeded the Pope and sought to punish Luther and Luther's adherents. Luther, however, was able to defy both Pope and Emperor. Many priests and monks in Germany sympathized with Luther and refused to recognize the papal decree against him, and a large number of influential princes and noblemen at once championed the revolutionary doctrine and resisted the Emperor's efforts to suppress it by force.

Luther's Support in Germany. — Luther himself flooded Germany with violent pamphlets against the Pope and the Catholic Church, and proved himself very skillful in attracting disciples. He knew how to combine all the different kinds of opposition to the Church. He drew support from pious and religious persons who were shocked by his picture of abuses within the Catholic Church; from patriotic Germans who were led by him to resent the subordination of their country to an Italian Pope; and from nobles and princes who were shown by him how they might increase their wealth and power at the expense of Church and Empire. To the princes and nobles Luther explained that if they would accept his teachings, there would be no need of a Papacy or of any elaborate religious organization, and they might seize the great estates of the monks and bishops and retain in their own country the taxes and fees that had hitherto been paid to the papal court at Rome. And many of these German leaders were not slow to act upon the

reformer's advice. They rebelled against the Catholic Church, confiscated its lands and revenues, and abolished Catholic worship on their estates.

Germany Divided between Lutheranism and Catholicism. — At one time it seemed as though the entire German nation would rebel against the Catholic Church, but when bands of peasants in southern Germany imitated the example of the nobles and rebelled against their rulers in State as well as in Church, the princes grew alarmed. The Peasants' Insurrection was put down with great cruelty in 1525, and the further spread of Lutheranism in Germany was checked. The peasants turned against Luther because he had taken sides strongly with the nobles, and many of the nobles, especially in southern Germany, began to perceive that what was sauce for the goose was sauce for the gander and that if they denied the authority of the Church in religious matters their peasants might again deny their authority in temporal affairs. Besides, the Emperor and some of the other German princes, either from policy or from conviction, were deaf to Luther's entreaties. The result was religious division in Germany. The Germans in the north accepted Luther's teaching and became known as Protestants,[1] while those in the south rejected it and remained Catholics.

Lutheranism Adopted by Scandinavian Kings. — What Luther lost in Germany was gained for his faith in Scandinavia, for subsequently the King of Denmark and Norway and the King of Sweden rebelled against the Catholic Church and used their growing autocratic power to make Lutheranism the established form of Christianity in their respective dominions. After the sixteenth century the vast majority of the people of Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and northern Germany were "Lutherans."

[1] Charles V, at a meeting of the Diet of the Holy Roman Empire at Speyer in 1529, directed that his earlier edict against heretics should be enforced and that the revenues of the Catholic Church should not be appropriated for heretical worship. The Lutheran princes who were attending the Diet drew up and signed a solemn "protest" against the Emperor's action. Hence the signers were termed "Protestants." Subsequently the word "Protestant" was assigned indiscriminately to all kinds of Western Christians outside the Catholic Church.

The Peace of Augsburg. — After protracted civil war in Germany between Catholics and Lutherans, the Emperor Charles V was prevailed upon in 1555 to agree to the so-called Religious Peace of Augsburg, which recognized and tolerated the new Lutheran form of Christianity. But what the Lutheran princes gained from the Emperor they were unwilling for a long time to grant to their people. Princes in Germany were free to choose whether they would be Catholic or Lutheran, but the common people were not: they had to conform to the religion of their prince.

Henry VIII and the Anglican Church. — While some seeds of the revolt in England against the Catholic Church had been sown by religious reformers, it was actually the work of an ambitious King. Henry VIII (1509–1547) had no sympathy with Luther. Indeed this English King received from Pope Leo X the title of "Defender of the Faith" for a book which he wrote against the theological novelties of the German reformer. But Henry VIII, despite his theological orthodoxy and his hatred of heresy, was eager to exalt the royal authority. Moreover, he was disappointed that he had no son to succeed him and vexed because the Pope would not free him from his wife and permit him to marry a young and pretty court-maid upon whom he had set his heart.

King Henry VIII of England
From a famous contemporary portrait by Holbein.

Henry as Head of the Anglican Church. — The English Parliament at this time was thoroughly subservient to the monarch, and so Henry VIII had no great difficulty in persuading the Parliament

in 1534 to pass an "Act of Supremacy," under which the King was substituted for the Pope as head of the Christian Church in England. Henry was thus enabled to undertake such marriage ventures as pleased his fancy, and at the same time to take lands and other property from the Church and appoint his own friends to offices in the Church. There might have been widespread popular opposition to the King's religious policy, had not Henry VIII raised a hue and cry against the corruption of the monks, suppressed their monasteries, and divided their extensive property between himself and a large number of English nobles. Thenceforth these nobles were staunch advocates of continued separation from the Catholic Church. What popular opposition did arise, was sternly repressed with beheadings and burnings.

The Church of England. — Until his death in 1547, Henry VIII did what he could to preserve Catholic theology and Catholic worship in his "Church of England." But under his weak and sickly son, Edward VI (1547–1553), Anglicanism[1] was influenced by revolutionary ideas from the Continent and became markedly Protestant. The Bible was recognized as the sole guide to faith; the Catholic doctrine of "good works" was pronounced superstitious; the sacraments were altered; and the prayer books were translated from Latin into English and considerably changed.

For a brief period after the death of Edward VI and the accession of his sister, Queen Mary Tudor (1553–1558), England was reconciled to the Papacy. Protestants who refused to return to the Catholic Church were now persecuted; some were burned at the stake.

However, the long reign of the last of the Tudor sovereigns and autocrats of England, Queen Elizabeth, from 1558 to 1603, witnessed the restoration of the Protestant Church of England as it had been in the reign of Edward VI and its acceptance by the masses of Englishmen. From Elizabeth's time to the present day the Anglican or Episcopal Church has remained the "established church" of England, that is, the religion of the majority of Englishmen, formally recognized and supported by the State. A minority

[1] "Anglicanism" means the faith and practice of the "Church of England" or "Episcopal Church."

of Englishmen remained Catholic, but their number was reduced in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by persecution and penal laws, and it was not until modern times that there was any notable lightening of their burdens or increase in their numbers.

Failure to Destroy Catholicism in Ireland. — In Ireland the English sovereigns attempted to deal with the Catholic Church as they dealt with it in England. They established a "Church of Ireland" which in doctrine and organization resembled closely the Protestant "Church of England." The mass of the native Irish, however, remained loyal to the Catholic Church, despite protracted and bitter persecution. Large colonies of English and Scottish Protestants were settled in Ireland, especially in Ulster, but to this day the majority of the inhabitants of Ireland are Catholic Christians.

John Calvin, the French Reformer. — Anglican and Lutheran churches were not the only Protestant bodies which came into existence in the sixteenth century. Calvinistic churches also appeared, and their founder, John Calvin (1509–1564), proved to be even more influential than Henry VIII or Martin Luther. John Calvin was a Frenchman. In his youth he studied at Paris to become a priest, but growing unsettled in his religious convictions he turned to law. When he was twenty years of age, he experienced a "conversion" and felt himself divinely called to forsake the Catholic Church and to become the apostle of a simpler form of Christianity. Most of his fellow Frenchmen, though critical of abuses in the Church, believed it was better to remain Catholics than to secede. Moreover, the French King Francis I was a determined foe of heresy. So Calvin left his native land and took refuge in Switzerland.

The Institutes. — In 1536 Calvin published a famous book, "The Institutes of the Christian Religion," an account of his own religious opinions. It was clear and concise, and contained the germ of all that later developed as "Calvinism." For a time it seemed as if the "Institutes" might provide a common platform for all Christians who were in revolt against the Catholic Church. But Calvin was quite a different kind of person from Luther. Luther, the ex-monk, was emotional and impetuous. Calvin, as

became a French lawyer, was severely logical. Besides, Luther was willing to leave everything in the Protestant Church which was not prohibited by the Bible, while Calvin insisted that nothing should be retained by the Protestants which was not expressly authorized by the Bible. Calvin was much more thorough in his revolt than Luther.

Calvin at Geneva. — Calvin established himself in the French-Swiss city of Geneva in 1536, and thenceforth almost continuously until his death in 1564 he was the town's religious oracle and political dictator. At Geneva this "Protestant Pope," as he was sometimes called, introduced into social life a severity and "puritanism" unknown throughout earlier centuries. Dancing, gambling, theatrical entertainment, jewelry, and gay clothes were prohibited under heavy penalties; immoralities were punished with rigor; and Sunday was observed, not as a joyous holiday, but as a day on which everybody was compelled to attend church and listen to lengthy sermons.

A Wealthy Merchant of the Sixteenth Century

Spread of Calvinism. — Calvinism, as the kind of Christianity was called which was preached by John Calvin, spread farther and affected more diverse peoples than Lutheranism or Anglicanism. This was for several reasons. In the first place, Calvin's logical mind and legal training enabled him to formulate a system of beliefs that appealed strongly to the lawyers and intelligent middle-class people in all countries. Secondly, Calvin's definite approval of the taking of interest on loans and his break with the economic doctrines of the Middle Age[1] earned him the support of many traders, bankers, and other well-to-do middle-class persons — the new and rising class of capitalists. In fact, it might be said that if the chief strength of Lutheranism and Anglicanism was drawn from the landed aristocracy, that of Calvinism

[1] See p 552

was derived from the wealthy and intelligent middle class. Thirdly, Calvinism was so clear in its theology, so simple in its organization (there were to be no popes or bishops, but only presbyters or ministers), so plain in its worship, and so earnest in its moral teachings, that it attracted large followings of plain, simple people in many different countries. Fourthly, Calvinism was generally condemned by kings and princes as leading to too much diversity, and this very fact gave it the reputation of being democratic and of inspiring its followers to resist tyranny and oppression. Finally, Calvin himself was a firm believer in the benefits of higher education. The schools which he established at Geneva were so famous that students flocked to them from distant places, and when they returned to their homes they were usually prepared to preach Calvinism.

A Protestant Minister of the Seventeenth Century

The pastor of a Calvinist church in Strasbourg. From a contemporary engraving.

Calvinism on the Continent. — In this way the germs of Calvinistic Christianity were scattered far and wide. The "Reformed Religion," as Calvinism was most frequently styled, became the religion of a majority of the Swiss people. It was adopted by the inhabitants of the northern Netherlands (Holland) and helped to inspire them to revolt against their King, Philip II of Spain. It spread, moreover, into Germany. There after a long and bloody civil war, lasting from 1618 to 1648, it was finally recognized by the Emperor as being on an equal footing with Lutheranism and Catholicism.[1] It secured the adherence of a large number of Magyars. In France, Calvin's native country, it made few converts among the nobility and almost none among the peasantry, but it won from the Catholic Church many persons of the middle class, perhaps a thirtieth of the whole nation. These French Calvinists — or Huguenots, as they were called — were granted religious toleration in 1598 by the Edict of Nantes of King Henry IV.[2]

[1] See pp. 802–804. [2] See pp. 804–805.

In Scotland. John Knox. — In the British Isles Calvinism had marked success. In Scotland it was introduced by John Knox, who had studied under Calvin at Geneva. In 1560 he persuaded the Scottish nobles to abolish the Catholic Church in their country and to erect in its stead a Calvinistic state-church — the Presbyterian Church of Scotland.

In England and New England. — Into England, too, Calvinism came alike from Scotland and from the Continent. Presbyterian churches were established, and for a long time a stubborn struggle was waged by Calvinists to control the newly founded Church of England and subsequently to secure toleration for themselves. Early in the seventeenth century a group of English Protestants of Calvinist faith, unable at that time to practice their religion freely at home, left England, and, after a brief sojourn among the Calvinists of Holland, sailed in the *Mayflower* to Plymouth Bay in Massachusetts; these Pilgrims laid the foundation of Calvinism in the New World.

Radical Sects. — Calvinism, Anglicanism, and Lutheranism were the chief but not the only forms of Protestantism which emerged in the sixteenth century. In the midst of the ferment and upheaval of the time, religious groups far more radical than Luther and Henry VIII, and even more radical than Calvin, raised their voices in vehement protest against the Catholic Church and gained followings here and there throughout Western Europe.

Mennonites, Baptists, and Quakers. — There was Menno Simons, for example, a Dutchman, who in 1536 withdrew from the Catholic Church and became the leader of a group of religious radicals — the so-called "Anabaptists" — who established themselves in the German city of Münster, scandalizing Lutherans and Catholics alike. Menno set no value on learning or on elaborate dogmas; he stressed the "new life"; he condemned war, the taking of oaths, and infant baptism. From Menno sprang the sect of "Mennonites," which has persisted to this day in Germany and which has been transplanted to the United States. In England, moreover, Menno's ideas on baptism were adopted by independent congregations subsequently known as Baptists, while his condemnation of war

was reëchoed in the seventeenth century by George Fox, the English founder of the Society of Friends, or "Quakers."

Servetus and Socinus. — Still more radical than Menno were two other Protestant leaders of the sixteenth century, Michael Servetus (sēr-vē′tŭs, 1511–1553) and Faustus Socinus (sō-sī′nŭs, 1539–1604). Servetus, a Spaniard, questioned the doctrine of the Trinity and was burned for heresy at Geneva under the direction of John Calvin. Socinus, an Italian who lived in Poland the last twenty-five years of his life, insisted that Luther and Calvin had not gone far enough in their break with the Catholic Church, that the only solid basis on which Protestantism could rest was human reason, and that everything which contradicted reason should be rejected as false. These teachings were quite contrary to the doctrines of most Protestants of that day as well as to the historic dogmas of Catholic Christianity, and at first they were not widely accepted. In course of time, however, groups of Calvinists, Lutherans, and even Anglicans came to renounce "miracles" and to question the divinity of the founder of Christianity. The ideas of many modern "liberal" Christians are derived from these sources.

Reform of the Catholic Church

Reform within the Catholic Church. — At the very time when the three major forms of Protestanism — Lutheran, Anglican, and Calvinist — were coming into existence, a reformation occurred in the Catholic Church. There was much the same religious ferment in Italy, Austria, France, and Spain, as in Germany, Scandinavia, England, and Switzerland, but in the former countries it resulted not in wholesale revolt against the old Christian Church but rather in removal of abuses.

The Council of Trent. — A series of upright and farsighted Popes during the second half of the sixteenth century vastly improved the government of the Church and gave a higher moral tone to the clergy. Under their auspices was convened a General Church Council — the Council of Trent (1545–1563) — which reaffirmed and strengthened the Catholic teachings of earlier centuries and instituted needful reforms in finance and education. A definite catechism was prepared at Rome and every layman was to be in-

structed in the beliefs and obligations of his religion. Revisions were made in the service-books of the Church, and a new standard edition of the Vulgate, the Latin Bible, was issued. A list, called the Index, was prepared of dangerous and heretical books, which Catholics were prohibited from reading. Lapses from faith were to be punishable by the ecclesiastical court of the Inquisition, which now zealously redoubled its activity, especially in Spain and in Italy.



THE COUNCIL OF TRENT IN SESSION
From a contemporary engraving.

Ignatius Loyola. — One of the most important agencies of reform within the Catholic Church was a new religious order, the Society of Jesus, whose members are known commonly as Jesuits. The Society was founded by Ignatius Loyola (lō-yō′lä) in 1534. Ignatius had been a Spanish soldier, who, while in a hospital, suffering from a wound, chanced to read a Life of Christ and biographies of several saints. This reading, he tells us, worked such a change within him that from being a soldier of an earthly king he resolved forthwith to become a knight of Christ and the Church and to fight for the greater glory of God. It was in the same year in

which the German monk, Martin Luther, became the foremost enemy of the Catholic Church that the Spanish soldier, Ignatius Loyola, began the remarkable career which was to make him Catholicism's chief champion.

Work of the Jesuits. — The Jesuits, from the very year of their establishment, rushed to the front in the religious conflict of the sixteenth century. In the first place, they founded many schools and colleges, and as teachers they had in Europe for many years no superiors and few equals. By their wide learning and culture they won back a considerable respect for the Catholic clergy. As preachers, too, they earned high esteem by the clearness and simplicity of their sermons and instruction.

It was in the mission field, however, that the Jesuits achieved the most striking results. They were mainly responsible for the recovery of Poland after that country had almost become Protestant. They similarly conserved Catholic Christianity in Bavaria and in Belgium. They insured a large Catholic following in Czechoslovakia and in Hungary. At the hourly risk of their lives they ministered to fellow Catholics in England. And what the Catholic Church lost in numbers through the defection of the greater part of northern Europe was counterbalanced by Jesuit (and Franciscan and Dominican) missions in India and China, among the Huron and Iroquois tribes of North America, and among the savages of Brazil and Paraguay.

Concordats with Monarchs. — In order to maintain Catholicism in Spain, Portugal, France, Italy, and Austria, the Pope entered into treaties, or "concordats," with the rulers of those countries, whereby special ecclesiastical privileges were conferred upon the sovereigns. This tended, in course of time, to make the Catholic Church subservient to royal governments. It was not until the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, after drastic political and social revolutions, that the Catholic Church regained most of the freedom which it lost by concordats in the sixteenth century.

Inter-Christian Intolerance and War

Outburst of Intolerance in Sixteenth Century. — At the opening of the sixteenth century almost all inhabitants of Western

Europe were Catholic Christians, living in religious peace with one another. At the close of the century, after the rise of Protestant Churches, there were still Catholic Christians but there were also Lutheran Christians and Anglican Christians and Calvinist Christians and innumerable little sects such as Mennonites, Baptists, and Socinians, quarrelling with each other and persecuting and fighting. Ecclesiastical unity had been destroyed. The chief explanation of the ensuing intolerance and war lies in the fact that the rulers of every state throughout Western Europe, whether they were Catholic or Protestant, clung to the earlier idea that political unity depended largely upon religious unity and that therefore each state should use its power and influence to oblige all its Christian citizens to conform to one official form of Christianity. And usually the leaders of the various Churches, Catholic and Protestant, encouraged and urged on the rulers of states. The immediate effect was an outburst of religious intolerance and war such as the world never witnessed before or since.

King Philip II of Spain
From a portrait painted in 1598, the year of his death.

Policies of Philip II. — The Spanish, Portuguese, and Italian monarchs compelled their subjects to remain Catholic or to suffer death or imprisonment at the hands of the Inquisition. Not

only that, but the King of Spain, Philip II (1555–1598), became a most fanatical champion of the Catholic Church and sought by any available means to assure the triumph of Catholicism not only in his own lands but in other lands as well. He stamped out Protestantism in Spain, and in the process put several thousand heretics to death. He allowed only Catholics to emigrate to the Spanish colonies in America, and to preserve their faith he invoked the aid of the Inquisition in the New World. He gave military assistance to militant French Catholics in their struggle with the Huguenots. He sent armies into Germany to support the attempt of the Holy Roman Emperor to crush Lutherans and Calvinists there. By marrying Mary Tudor, the Queen of England (1553–1558), Philip II sought to preserve Catholicism in England, and then when Mary's successor, Elizabeth (1558–1603), abandoned Catholicism and became a Protestant, Philip plotted against Elizabeth and eventually, in 1588, sent against England a vast fleet of warships — the so-called Armada — which, however, was destroyed partly by the valor of English seamen and partly by force of wind and violence of wave. As ruler of the Netherlands Philip II had to face the determined opposition of a large part of the Dutch people who had become Calvinists; the resulting war was protracted and was attended by massacres and atrocities on both sides, leading finally in 1648, after Philip's death, to the establishment of Holland as an independent state.

Religious Wars in Germany. — In the Holy Roman Empire the Emperor and a majority of the Electors remained Catholic, but many princes became Lutheran and some became Calvinist. Protestant princes persecuted Catholic subjects; Catholic princes persecuted Protestant subjects; and Protestant princes warred with the Catholic Emperor. After a bitter struggle, a treaty — the "Peace of Augsburg" — was signed in 1555, as we have seen, between the Emperor and the princes, whereby each prince obtained the privilege of being either Lutheran or Catholic as he might desire and also the privilege of making his subjects adopt the form of Christianity which he chose.

The Thirty Years' War. — The conflict was renewed in the Thirty Years' War (1618–1648), which was really a long series of

wars, more political and economic than religious in nature. Although it began as a religious civil war within the Holy Roman Empire, the Thirty Years' War broadened out into a great international war, in which the greed of monarchs for additional territory was the prevailing motive. The immediate cause of war was a rebellion in Bohemia (Czechoslovakia) on the part of Calvinist noblemen who elected as their king a Calvinist prince, the Elector Frederick. The Calvinists were defeated by the armies of the Emperor, but soon the war was resumed on a larger scale, when some of the Lutheran princes in northern Germany, aided by the Lutheran king of Denmark, arrayed themselves against the Emperor and against the various Catholic German princes who were loyal to him. Again the Imperial armies were victorious, but again the war was renewed, this time by another Lutheran king, Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden. Strangely enough, Gustavus Adolphus was aided with arms and money by France, a Catholic country, and after his death in battle France became the chief enemy of the Emperor. Cardinal Richelieu,[1] the chief adviser of the French King, joined forces with the Protestant Germans, Swedes, and Dutch, against the Emperor and against his ally, the Habsburg King of Spain, for the purely political motive of strengthening France and weakening her rivals — Spain and Austria.

French victories compelled the Emperor at last to make peace. The various treaties that were signed in 1648 by the numerous states which had been at war may be grouped together under the name "the Peace of Westphalia." According to the peace treaties: (1) France received Alsace, excepting the city of Strasbourg; (2) Sweden received two strips of German territory (western Pomerania and Bremen) which gave the Swedes control of the mouths of the Oder, Elbe, and Weser rivers; (3) Brandenburg[2] annexed eastern Pomerania and several provinces previously owned by Catholic bishops; (4) Holland (the Dutch Netherlands) and Switzerland were formally recognized as independent; (5) each German state, within the Holy Roman Empire, was to be free to make peace or war without even consulting the Emperor; (6) as regards religion, Calvinists were placed on an equal footing

[1] See p. 821. [2] See pp. 840–841.

with Lutherans and Catholics, and all church property was to remain in the hands of those who owned it in 1624.

Intolerance in England. — In the British Isles there was similar intense religious intolerance. Henry VIII in his effort to establish and maintain a separate, middle-of-the-road Anglican Church, burned Lutherans and beheaded Catholics. Mary Tudor, in her attempt to restore Catholicism, persecuted and burned Anglicans and Calvinists. Elizabeth and her Anglican successors enacted drastic laws against Catholics and put many of them to death, and at the same time harassed and imprisoned Protestant dissenters from Anglicanism, such as Baptists, Quakers, and Presbyterians. It was to escape from persecution in England that Pilgrims came to Massachusetts and Catholics to Maryland in the seventeenth century. In the seventeenth century, too, Calvinists in England were in the forefront of a great civil war which culminated in the beheading of King Charles I (1649). But the rights which Calvinists claimed for themselves they were long unwilling to accord to others; they were even more stern than Anglicans in persecuting Catholics.

In Other Countries. — In Scandinavia the Lutheran Kings of Denmark and Sweden stamped out Catholicism with fire and sword. The Catholic Kings of Poland and Hungary took the same kind of measures against Protestants. The Calvinist nobles of Scotland rose in arms against their Catholic Queen Mary Stuart, and deposed her, and she was eventually put to death by the Anglican Queen Elizabeth of England (1587).

French Civil Wars and the Edict of Nantes. — France was prey to religious wars during the greater part of the sixteenth century. Most of these French civil wars were three-cornered struggles among a faction of Huguenots who endeavored to dominate the country, a faction of militant Catholics who wished to destroy the Huguenots, and a faction of "political" Catholics who were less interested in the complete triumph of any particular religion than in the preservation of national unity. Sometimes the King cooperated with one faction and sometimes with another; it was while under the influence of the militant Catholic faction that a French King directed in 1572 the massacre of St. Bartholomew's

EUROPE, ABOUT 1600 A. D.

RELIGIOUS DIVISIONS IN

Day, in which several thousand Huguenots were cruelly butchered. In time the faction of political Catholics increased in numbers and influence, and with the support of the Huguenot faction it finally established on the throne, in 1589, a King (Henry IV) who had been a Huguenot, who now became a Catholic, and who proceeded by the Edict of Nantes (1598) to grant religious toleration to Huguenots. France was the first country which discovered a means of reconciling religious diversity with national unity, and though a hundred years later a French King revoked the Edict of Nantes the lesson of religious toleration was by this time being learned and applied in other countries.

Slow Growth of Tolerance. — The immediate effect of the sixteenth-century break in the Christian Church was, as we have seen, to increase religious intolerance and to cause numerous religious wars. In the long run, however, the break served to show the need and the possibility of a more tolerant attitude of Christians toward one another. In Protestant countries the Catholic minority espoused the principle of religious toleration, while in Catholic countries Protestants were natural advocates of toleration. Gradually, as the number of different Protestant Churches and sects increased, and as Protestants and Catholics found it impossible (if not undesirable) to get rid of each other, religious intolerance perceptibly decreased. The rigor of the Spanish Inquisition abated in the latter part of the seventeenth century. The last Catholic to be put to death in England for his religion was Oliver Plunket, the archbishop of Armagh (in 1681). And the eighteenth century registered on all sides a pronounced decline of persecuting ardor and the repeal of many intolerant laws.

Religious Toleration a Recent Development. — But it was left for modern times — really for recent times — to witness the triumph of the principle of religious toleration and the cessation of religious wars. The Era of Transition from the Middle Age to Modern Times only pointed the way. Now, Christianity is again, basically, the peacefully missionary religion which it was in its early Roman times. Nowadays religion is regarded as a private and voluntary affair, and religious toleration is generally considered to be a gain for the human mind and for the world.

The Three Great Divisions of Christianity

Long before the rise of Protestant Churches in the sixteenth century there had been a great division of Christianity between the Orthodox East and the Catholic West. What happened in the sixteenth century was a splitting of the Catholic West into two parts — the surviving Catholic area and a new Protestant region. Thenceforth three main forms of Christianity existed side by side — Catholic, Protestant, and Orthodox.

Geographical Distribution. — As a result of the rise of Protestant Churches, Catholic Christianity was confined after the sixteenth century chiefly to Italy, Spain, Portugal, France, the southern Netherlands (Belgium), the forest cantons of Switzerland, southern Germany (including the Rhineland, Bavaria, and Austria), Ireland, Poland, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, most of Hungary, northern Yugoslavia, South America, Central America, Mexico, most of the West Indies, Quebec, and the Philippine Islands; while Protestant Christianity embraced northern and central Germany, Scandinavia, Finland, Esthonia, Latvia, the northern Netherlands (Holland), most of Switzerland, Scotland, England, the United States, most of Canada, South Africa, and Australia. In some of these areas there was a good deal of overlapping: Protestant minorities existed in France, Ireland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia; Catholic minorities survived and actually grew in Germany, the Baltic States, Holland, the United States, and throughout the British Empire. In general, however, northern Europe became Protestant while southern and central Europe remained Catholic. At the same time eastern Europe (Russia, Rumania, the Balkan regions, and Greece) remained within the area of Orthodox Christianity, although a part of it was long governed by Moslem Turks and in the other part (Russia) several heretical sects developed.

Similarities among the Churches. — Catholic, Protestant, and Orthodox countries continued to have much in common. They could still be viewed as a unit when contrasted in social customs and institutions with the cultural areas of Islam and Buddhism. All Christians still revered Jesus as their common founder and

inspirer; all magnified the Bible and cherished traditions of early Christianity. Moreover, the vast majority of Protestants, like Catholics and Orthodox, retained much of the theology of the early Christian Church, such as belief in the Trinity, in the divinity of Jesus, in the fall of man and his redemption through the sacrifice of the Cross, and in a future life of rewards and punishments. Christian moralities and virtues continued to be upheld by Protestants, Orthodox, and Catholics.

Theological Differences. — Protestants were in agreement with Eastern Orthodox Christians against Catholics on one doctrinal point, and that was the denial of the claims of the Bishop of Rome and the consequent rejection of the papal government and authority. But on other theological points Protestants were as far removed from Orthodox as from Catholic Christians. Protestants made important changes in the sacramental system; they rejected certain beliefs and practices, such as purgatory, invocation of saints, veneration of relics, etc.; they proclaimed the right and ability of each person to interpret the Bible and to do Christ's will without the aid of any Church. To the Protestant, final authority in religious matters rested with the Bible and each Christian's reading of the Bible; to Catholic and Orthodox, it rested with a living institution or Church.

The Protestant idea of authority made it possible and essentially inevitable that there should be differences of opinion among Protestants. As a result, Protestantism gave birth to a great variety of national Churches and local sects, differing in many respects from one another.

Cultural Contrasts. — Between Protestant and Catholic countries certain social and cultural contrasts appeared in addition to doctrinal differences. Protestants had a marked antipathy to monasticism, to the veneration of saints, and to anything which seemed to them to savor of "superstition" with the result that in Protestant countries monasteries with their schools and libraries and charities were suppressed, religious paintings were destroyed, statues of the saints and stained-glass windows were smashed, and church holidays were abolished. The Puritans opposed the theater and drama, and their solemn observance of Sunday was

in contrast to the general medieval observance of feast and festival.

Growth of Skepticism. — The break-up of Christianity into three main divisions was fateful in two particular respects. First, it interfered seriously with the growth and expansion of Christianity. Catholics, Protestants, and Orthodox were so engrossed in mutual quarrels that they partially paralyzed each other's missionary efforts. And, confronted by the scandal of a badly divided Christianity, an increasing number of thoughtful persons grew skeptical about Christianity as a whole or in any of its parts.



A Protestant Church of the Seventeenth Century

From a contemporary engraving.

Increasing Secularization. — Secondly, civilization in modern times has been more and more *secular* in character, that is, the state has done more and more of the things which in the Middle Age the Church did; and both the Catholic Church and the Protestant Churches have therefore become less conspicuous and less active as leaders of civilization. The very tendency to make of religion a purely spiritual matter of the "inner life" has favored, for weal or woe, this outward secularization.

The fact remains, however, that the Christian Church does not occupy in modern times so great a position of civilizing influence and social control as it held in the Middle Age.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. What were the political and economic reasons for opposition to the Church in the Era of Transition?

2. Discuss the political and economic results of the break in the Church in the sixteenth century, with special reference to: the relations between Church and State in Protestant countries; the Concordats; the confiscation of Church property; and the wars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

3. Compare the Lollards and Hussites with the reformers of the sixteenth century.

4. What were the immediate causes of the Lutheran movement in Germany? How do you account for Luther's success?

5. Give a sketch of the career of John Calvin, and explain how his doctrines differed from those of Luther.

6. How did the Council of Trent deal with the problems confronting the Church in the sixteenth century?

7. How did the Jesuits strengthen the position of the Catholic Church?

8. What were the concordats which were negotiated in the sixteenth century? What effect did they have on the position of the Church in Catholic countries?

9. By what methods did Philip II seek to oppose Protestantism? To what extent did he succeed?

10. Describe the internal conflicts in France which led to the Edict of Nantes.

11. Give instances to illustrate the prevalence of religious intolerance in the sixteenth century.

12. On the map point out the regions which became Calvinist; Lutheran; Anglican. Which countries remained largely Catholic? Which countries remained Orthodox?

13. Discuss the general effects of the religious changes of the sixteenth century.

SPECIAL TOPICS

The 95 Theses. Robinson, *Readings*, II, 57–61; McGiffert, *Martin Luther*, 76–100; P. Smith, *Age of the Reformation*, 62–74; Janssen, *History of the German People*, III, 79–99.

Luther's Address to the German Nobility. Robinson, *Readings*, II, 74–108.

The Peasants' War. Robinson, *Readings*, II, 94–108; McGiffert, *Martin Luther*, 250–261.

Calvin. Robinson, *Readings*, II, 122–134; Walker, *Christian Church*, 389–401; Smith, *Age of the Reformation*, 160–181; Taylor, *Thought and Expression in the 16th Century*, 389–427.

Henry VIII and the English Church. Robinson, *Readings*, II, 137–152; Walker, *History of the Christian Church*, 401–415; Smith, *Age of the Reformation*, 277–309; Beard, *English Historians*, 264–273; Cheyney, *Short History of England*, 289–312.

The Council of Trent. ROBINSON, *Readings*, II, 156–161; SMITH, *Age of the Reformation*, 388–396.

Charles V. ROBINSON, *Readings*, II, 165–167; HAYES, *Modern Europe*, I, 74–87.

Religious wars in France. ADAMS, *Growth of the French Nation*, ch. xi; SMITH, *Age of the Reformation*, 210–233.

Philip II. HAYES, *Modern Europe*, I, 87–106; ROBINSON, *Readings*, II, 168–179.

John Knox and Calvinism in Scotland. SMITH, *Age of the Reformation*, 350–370; LINDSAY, *History of the Reformation*, II, 274–314.

Ignatius Loyola and the Society of Jesus. SMITH, *Age of the Reformation*, 396–411; LINDSAY, *History of the Reformation*, II, 525–563; FRANCIS THOMPSON, *Saint Ignatius;* P. VAN DYKE, *Ignatius Loyola.*

Wycliffe and Huss. WALKER, *History of the Christian Church*, 298–306; TAYLOR, *Thought and Expression in the 16th Century*, II, 20–36.

Rise of capitalism in the sixteenth century. SMITH, *Age of the Reformation*, 515–541, 548–552.

Condition of the working classes. SMITH, *Age of the Reformation*, 552–562.

Education. SMITH, *Age of the Reformation*, 661–673.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THE TEACHER

PRESERVED SMITH, *Age of the Reformation.* T. M. LINDSAY, *History of the Reformation* (2 vols.). H. O. TAYLOR, *Thought and Expression in the 16th Century* (2 vols.). L. VON RANKE, *History of the Reformation in Germany.* C. HARE (Mrs. M. Andrews), *A Great Emperor, Charles V.* L. VON PASTOR, *History of the Popes.* J. JANSSEN, *History of the German People at the Close of the Middle Ages* (16 vols.). T. J. CAMPBELL, *The Jesuits, 1534–1921.* J. S. SCHAPIRO, *Social Reform and the Reformation.* S. R. GARDINER, *Thirty Years' War.* W. WALKER, *John Calvin.* H. Y. REYBURN, *John Calvin.* P. VAN DYKE, *Ignatius Loyola.* FRANCIS THOMPSON, *Saint Ignatius Loyola.* A. C. MCGIFFERT, *Martin Luther.* P. SMITH, *Life and Letters of Martin Luther.* H. GRISAR, *Luther* (6 vols.). A. F. POLLARD, *Henry VIII.* F. A. GASQUET, *Henry VIII and the English Monasteries.* CAMBRIDGE MODERN HISTORY, II.

CONVENIENT SOURCE MATERIALS

ROBINSON, *Readings*, II. P. SMITH AND C. M. JACOBS, *Luther's Correspondence.* P. SMITH AND H. P. GALLINGER, *Conversations with Luther.* F. G. STOKES, *Epistolæ obscurorum virorum, the Latin Text with an English Rendering.* JOHN CALVIN, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (Warfield ed.). GEE AND HARDY, *Documents illustrative of English Church History.*



EUROPE, 1650 A.D.

CHAPTER XXIV

AUTOCRACY IN ACTION AND DECLINE

The English Revolutions of the Seventeenth Century

In an earlier chapter we have noted how autocracy was revived in England by the Tudor monarchs who reigned from 1485 to 1603.[1] This meant that, while these monarchs preserved the form of the constitutional government which had flourished in England in the Middle Age, they actually controlled the Parliament, dominated the Church, regulated commerce, and did just about what they pleased.

Reasons for English Opposition to Autocracy. — (1) With the death of Queen Elizabeth, the last of the Tudors, in 1603, a change occurred. The throne passed to a distant cousin, a member of the *Stuart family*, who was James VI of Scotland and who now became James I of England. In this way England and Scotland were united under the same king, but Englishmen did not have the same affection for the "foreign" Stuart family as they had had for their own Tudor monarchs. They grew restless and began to protest against royal despotism.

(2) James I (1603–1625) was not content to be an autocrat in fact, like his predecessor; he claimed that he had a "*divine right*" to be an autocrat. Yet neither he nor his son, Charles I (1625–1649), had the ability to make good such a claim. James I was so undignified and awkward in appearance, so cowardly in face of peril, that people were merely amused or irritated when he insisted that he possessed absolute authority by "divine right." Charles I was more kingly in appearance and more manly in character, but he was vain and he made the mistake of boasting that he was an autocrat. An abler man would have wielded absolute power and said nothing about it.

[1] See p. 703.

(3) Moreover, there were *religious reasons* for popular dislike of the Stuart Kings. Both James I and Charles I were zealous, almost fanatical, members of the Anglican Church, as it had been established by Henry VIII and Elizabeth.[1] This was not popular in Scotland, where the Calvinist Presbyterian Church was the established religion.[2] Nor was it popular with all Englishmen. In the latter part of the sixteenth century, large numbers of middle-class Englishmen had adopted Calvinistic doctrines.[3] Because they desired a "purer" (that is, simpler) form of worship, these people are usually called Puritans. There were three kinds of Puritans: (*a*) Some wished to reform the Anglican Church from the inside, by doing away with ceremonies, altars, statues, paintings, and stained-glass windows. (*b*) A second group of Puritans wished to abolish the Anglican system of bishops, and to establish instead the Presbyterian form of church-organization, as it existed in Scotland. These were the English Presbyterians. (*c*) The third group consisted of Independents or Separatists, who desired to separate from the Anglican Church and to form independent, self-governing congregations, free from all control. All three of these groups of Puritans were bitterly hostile to James I and Charles I.

(4) There were also *economic grievances* against the Stuart Kings. Without the consent of Parliament, James I and Charles I imposed new taxes ("tonnage and poundage," "ship money," etc.), which bore most heavily on the merchants, shipowners, and other middle-class townsmen. Such taxes simply added fuel to the fire, since the middle classes were already infuriated by religious oppression.

(5) All these factors combined to reinforce the *political opposition* to the Stuart Kings. The English Parliament had not been abolished. It still claimed the right to make laws and levy taxes.[4] As the majority of members in the House of Commons were Puritans, the Puritan middle class believed there would be little to fear from the King if only Parliament could control the government. Control by Parliament would put an end to autocracy.

[1] See pp. 792–793. [2] See p. 797. [3] See pp. 794–797.
[4] On the medieval position of the English Parliament, see pp. 593–594.

Personal Government of Charles I. — Matters came to a head during the reign of Charles I. This King was just as obstinately determined to assert his own absolute authority as the Puritans were to uphold Parliament. After quarreling with three successive Parliaments during the first four years of his reign, and after signing a formal statement of the Parliamentary claims (the so-called "Petition of Right," 1628),[1] Charles resolved to get along without any Parliament at all. For eleven years (1629–1640) he succeeded in ruling England by autocratic methods, without a Parliament.

The English people submitted, though there was rebellion in their hearts. The Presbyterians in Scotland, however, boldly took up arms against the King. In fright, King Charles re-established Parliament in 1640, and promised never to impose new taxes without its consent. Parliament demanded also that he promise never to appoint cabinet ministers without its approval, and that he give up his autocratic command over the army. These reforms, if granted, would have put an end to autocracy in England.

The Civil War. — Rather than surrender his authority tamely, King Charles I chose to fight. Parliament was equally resolute and raised troops in readiness for a struggle. In 1642 the King's soldiers and the Parliamentary forces came to blows. The "Civil War" had begun.

The "Cavaliers" at First Successful. — At the outset the fortunes of battle favored the "Cavaliers" (supporters of the King). The noblemen and the country gentlemen who loyally rallied around the royal standard made splendid cavalrymen, since most of them had practiced riding, hunting, and shooting as their favorite sports.

The "Roundheads" Finally Victorious. — Opposed to the Cavaliers were the "Roundheads"[2] or supporters of Parliament. Most of them were Puritans from the towns or from the farms. A few of them were Puritan noblemen. Their troops were at first

[1] The "Petition of Right" of 1628 was the second great document in the history of English liberty, the first having been "Magna Carta" of 1215. See pp. 591–593.

[2] This nickname was given them because the Puritans wore their hair short, instead of in long curls as the more fashionable Cavaliers wore it.

inexperienced and poorly organized. Later, when an earnest Puritan army officer by the name of Oliver Cromwell reorganized them, the tide of battle turned in favor of the Roundheads. The Cavaliers were utterly routed, and the King himself was taken captive (1646).

The Puritan Revolution. — No sooner had the Roundheads achieved victory than they broke up into factions. And soon the most radical faction of Puritans, the Independents, seized

From Traill's "Social England," © Cassell

CAVALIERS AND ROUNDHEADS

This cartoon, published in 1642, shows Cavaliers at the left urging their dog to attack the Roundheads' dog, at the right. Notice the difference in the costumes of the Cavaliers and Roundheads.

control of the government. They effected a revolution by beheading King Charles I (1649) and declaring England a Commonwealth. The Commonwealth was a republic, at least in name, but it was not a democracy. The Independent army officers who controlled the government did not dare hold a free election, for they knew that the mass of the population opposed their rule. They were kept in power by their army, not by the will of the people.

Military Dictatorship of Oliver Cromwell. — At length, the chief Independent general — Oliver Cromwell — set himself up as military dictator. Cromwell was one of the most interesting

characters in the whole drama. Before the Revolution he had been simply a prosperous farmer, and a member of the House of Commons, but the Civil War made him a leader — first a victorious general, then the supreme master of England. He was not a cultured aristocrat, but a man of iron will, fiery temper, and stern convictions. He constantly quoted the Bible and spoke and acted as though he believed that God had specially commissioned him.

Few English monarchs have shown greater ability than Oliver Cromwell in maintaining order and promoting prosperity. He suppressed an insurrection in Scotland and with great cruelty vanquished the Irish. He waged a successful commercial war with the Dutch. But even Cromwell found it impossible to provide a lasting substitute for the old form of government in England. Many of the common people still desired a monarchy, because they were accustomed to it. On the other hand, many of the Puritan soldiers hated the very thought of a King. Cromwell tried to find a compromise that would please both the conservative people and the republican soldiers.

Cromwell as Lord Protector (1653–1658). — Cromwell and his supporters drew up a written constitution, which they called the "Instrument of Government." This provided that there should be no King but that Oliver Cromwell should be "Lord Protector" for life, with very wide powers, including even the power to name his successor. The "Instrument of Government" revived the old institution of Parliament, with a few changes. But the Parliament under the Protectorate was little better than a farce; Cromwell remained in practice a dictator. His personal autocracy was successful because he was an extraordinarily able statesman and because he had an irresistible army at his command.

Collapse of the Commonwealth. — After the death of Oliver Cromwell in 1658, his son, Richard, became "Lord Protector." Richard was a well-intentioned young man, but he lacked his father's ability. He was too weak to control the ambitious generals who aspired to become dictators, the republicans who dreamed of trying new political experiments, the royalists who wished to restore a Stuart King, and the Presbyterians who

Oliver Cromwell Conferring with Lawyers

The Lord Protector is sitting on a corner of the bed of the King who had been put to death. The letters "C R" on the bedstead stand for "Carolus Rex" ("Charles, King"). What idea of Cromwell do you get from

planned to force their particular creed on the whole country. Richard Cromwell knew his weakness and resigned his office.

The Stuart Restoration. — For a time it seemed probable that England would be the victim of successive military dictators. One of the generals, however, ordered the election of a new Parliament,[1] which proceeded to invite Charles II, son of the unfortunate Charles I, to return to England as King. By this Restoration of the Stuart monarchy (1660), the work of the Puritan Revolution seemed to be undone. The Commonwealth and Protectorate came to an end. Charles II was welcomed home with blazing bonfires and joyous ringing of bells, and England slipped back into the old habits. Once more Anglicanism was the state religion, while Dissenters[2] were persecuted.

Charles II and James II. — The restored Stuarts — Charles II (1660–1685) and his brother James II (1685–1688) — were at heart no less autocratic than their father (Charles I) and grandfather (James I) had been. Both believed that they reigned by "divine right" and that they were superior to Parliament. But unlike the earlier Stuarts, the restored Stuarts disliked Anglicanism as well as Calvinism and were attracted to the Catholic Church. They dreamed of using autocracy to make England again Catholic.

Union of Autocracy and Catholicism. — Charles II was witty, easy-going, and tactful. He did not boast of his autocracy, and he did not profess Catholicism until he was on his death-bed. James II, on the other hand, was more serious and less diplomatic. He openly became a Catholic, and he publicly asserted his power to "dispense" his subjects from laws passed by Parliament. By these means, he angered the large majority of Englishmen. Dissenters were furious at his disregard of Parliament and his encouragement of Catholicism. Anglicans feared that their state church was endangered by an autocrat who was Catholic. Indeed, it was the combination of Catholicism and autocracy which rendered the

[1] Strictly speaking, it was not a "Parliament" but a "Convention," because it was summoned without royal authority.

[2] A Dissenter (or Nonconformist) was a member of one of the various Protestant sects which opposed Anglicanism (that is, the Established Church of England). The Independents, the Baptists, the Presbyterians, the Quakers, and, in fact, most of the Puritans were "Dissenters."

position of James II more difficult than that of any of his predecessors.

The "Glorious" Revolution of 1688. — As long as the direct heirs to James II were his two Protestant daughters (Mary and Anne), many Englishmen thought they could endure him and hope for better things under his successors. But in 1688 a son was born to James II by his second wife, a Catholic. This changed the situation. All English Protestants knew that, by the law of royal succession, the son, rather than one of the daughters, would inherit the throne, and that the son would be educated in his father's religion as well as in the Stuart principles of "divine-right" monarchy. Very quickly Anglicans joined with Dissenters in asking Mary and her husband, William of Orange (ruler in Holland), to come over to England and assume the crown. Accordingly, William and Mary landed in England, with an army, and entered London without opposition.

James II, deserted even by his soldiers, fled without a struggle. As far as England was concerned, it was a bloodless revolution. Only in Scotland and Ireland was there any real fighting and there the supporters of James II were soon defeated.[1] An irregular Parliament — irregular because it met without royal sanction — deposed James II and recognized William and Mary as joint sovereigns (1689).

Victory of Parliament over Autocracy. — This peaceful revolution, often described by English historians as the "Glorious" Revolution of 1688, marked the final defeat of autocracy, and the triumph of Parliament in England. Thenceforth England was truly a limited monarchy, and there could be little chance of any future King's attempting to practice in that country the Stuart doctrine of absolute, divine-right monarchy.

The Bill of Rights, 1689. — Parliament confirmed its victory by passing a very important act or law known as the Bill of Rights. This act declared that the sovereign must thenceforth be a member of the Anglican Church. No future King was to claim the au-

[1] In Ireland the Catholic supporters of James II were decisively defeated by William in the famous battle of the Boyne (1690), the anniversary of which is still celebrated by the Protestants or "Orangemen" in Northern Ireland.

thority to "suspend" laws or "dispense" (that is, free) his subjects from punishment for disobeying laws, as James II and Charles II had done. The King must not levy taxes or maintain an army without Parliament's consent.[1] Members of Parliament must not be arbitrarily imprisoned for their political actions, or deprived of their freedom to express their opinions. Prisoners must be tried by impartial juries. The Bill of Rights was practically a constitution, limiting the powers of the King and safeguarding the powers of Parliament.

Other Important Laws. — Several other important laws may be regarded as indirect results of the English Revolution of 1688. The *Act of Toleration* (1689) granted to Protestant Dissenters, but not to Catholics, the right to worship freely. The *Act of Settlement* (1701) provided that, since William and Mary had no children, the crown should go, after William's death, to Anne, the younger Protestant daughter of James II, and, if Anne died without direct heirs, the crown should then pass to her cousin, George of Hanover, a German Protestant prince. Finally, the *Act of Union* (1707) made Scotland and England a really united kingdom (Great Britain), with one Parliament as well as with one sovereign.

Appearance of Political Parties. — Two political parties had appeared in England during the reign of Charles II — the Whigs and the Tories. The Whigs comprised almost the same groups as had supported the Roundhead cause in the Puritan Revolution, namely, the middle-class Dissenters, led by a few Puritan noblemen. The Tories, on the other side, were chiefly country gentlemen, noblemen, and, in general, persons of Anglican religion and conservative politics. With the triumph of Parliament in the Glorious Revolution of 1688, these parties of Whigs and Tories became even more important and began to take turns in winning elections, dominating Parliament, and directing the government. Thus a "two-party system" became a characteristic feature of later English politics.

[1] In 1689 the practice was begun of granting taxes and making army appropriations for one year at a time, and also of passing an annual *Mutiny Act.* Unless Parliament were called every year to make the appropriations and to reënact the Mutiny Act, the soldiers would receive no pay, and if they were guilty of mutiny (disobedience) they could not be punished.

Development of the Cabinet. — Another popular feature of later English politics — the "cabinet system" — may be regarded as an indirect product of the revolutions of the seventeenth century.[1] It was the custom of the Stuart Kings to select a small group of influential politicians, usually noblemen, as their advisers and assistants. The members of this group individually had charge of the various branches of administration, such as finance, or military affairs; they also met together with the King for the discussion of public matters. This small group of advisers, under Charles II, was called a "cabal"; later it became known as a "cabinet council," or "cabinet," because it met in a small private room (a cabinet).

Before the Revolution of 1688 the cabinet consisted of the King's personal favorites. After the Revolution, however, the important custom was established, gradually, of choosing the members of the cabinet from among the leaders of the political party possessing a majority in the House of Commons. King William (1689–1702) appointed Whigs to his cabinet when the Whigs controlled the Commons, and replaced them by Tories when the Tories gained a majority in the Commons. Queen Anne (1702–1714), though she would have preferred Tories, felt it wiser to appoint Whigs, during most of her reign. Under George I (1714–1727), the cabinet system was carried a step farther. As George was a German and could speak no English, he allowed his cabinet to manage affairs as it wished; he did not even attend cabinet meetings.

Thus two essential features of the cabinet system had developed: first, the direction of public affairs by the cabinet; secondly, the dependence of the cabinet upon a majority in the House of Commons. A third feature, the guidance of the cabinet by a "prime minister," developed during the eighteenth century. The first person to be generally recognized as "prime minister," a kind of president of the cabinet, was Sir Robert Walpole, a great Whig

[1] Though the cabinet developed in the seventeenth century, its origins are traceable to the Middle Age, when the King had been advised by a "Great Council," including the chief nobles and clergymen of the realm. This had been superseded, practically, by a smaller "Privy Council." The "cabal" or the "cabinet" was an inner circle of the Privy Council.

politician, who presided over the cabinet of George I and George II from 1721 to 1742.

Summary. — Autocracy, which arose in England as elsewhere in Europe in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, declined and practically disappeared in England as a result of the English Revolutions of the seventeenth century. By the eighteenth century, England again, as in the Middle Age, had a limited monarchy, and, what was more, now possessed a Parliament with an essentially modern party-system and an essentially modern cabinet-system.

The French Monarchy of Louis XIV

Autocracy had developed in France[1] at about the same time as it had developed in England, but it lasted longer in France than in England. During the seventeenth century, indeed, while English autocracy was being checked by the Puritan Revolution and destroyed by the "Glorious" Revolution, French autocracy was in full action in the monarchy of Louis XIV.

Reasons for French Acceptance of Autocracy. — (1) The *Bourbon family* which secured the throne at the conclusion of the French religious wars[2] gave to France far abler kings and ministers during the seventeenth century than the Stuart family gave to England. Henry IV (1589–1610) was a strong, popular leader who did much to heal the wounds of the religious wars and to promote the prosperity of the country. His son, Louis XIII (1610–1643), was personally weak, but he had the zealous assistance, throughout his reign, of a very able minister, Richelieu (rē′shē-lyû′), a Cardinal of the Catholic Church and a staunch upholder of royal authority. Louis XIV (1643–1715) was only a child when he came to the throne, but during his boyhood and youth the policies of Cardinal Richelieu were ably carried on by another great minister, Mazarin (mȧ′zȧ′răn′) by name, likewise a Cardinal of the Catholic Church.

(2) *French forces which might have opposed the royal authority were held in check.* The Estates-General,[3] a body corresponding to the English Parliament, was ignored and not permitted to meet,

[1] See pp. 704–705. [2] See p. 805. [3] See p. 600.

after 1614, for almost two centuries. The fortified castles of the nobility were destroyed, and the nobles were thereby deprived of means of defying the King. Religious dissenters (the Protestant Huguenots) continued to be tolerated during most of the seventeenth century, though they were shorn of political and military privileges. Under Richelieu, the King began to appoint special agents — the "intendants" — who were devoted to his service and who enforced his decrees throughout the country. The middle class, which in England opposed the King, in France supported the King.

Cardinal Richelieu

In 1661 Cardinal Mazarin died, and Louis XIV, now grown to manhood, took the actual conduct of French government into his own hands. Thanks to the previous efforts of his father and grandfather and of two Cardinals, Louis XIV found himself an absolute autocrat, with no practical limitations upon his royal authority.

Louis XIV and His Court. — Dignified and elegant in dress, manners, and speech, Louis XIV was the very personification of "divine-right" monarchy. It pleased him to be called the "Grand Monarch," as indeed he was. He chose as his special emblem the sun, the brightest of the heavenly bodies; and if we could see him as he sat on his gilded throne, beaming on a crowd of fawning courtiers, we would think the emblem quite appropriate. No palace in the world was so magnificent as the one he built at Versailles (vĕr′sä′y′, some twelve miles from Paris). The royal

family and hundreds of noblemen, as well as a host of servants and soldiers, could be housed there. From the gilded furniture to the paintings and priceless tapestries which adorned the King's palace, everything was designed to display the wealth and splendor of the Grand Monarch. Around the buildings were beautiful groves, artificial lakes, dozens of delightful fountains which tourists still admire, innumerable statues, and vast forests in which the King could hunt.

LOUIS XIV, THE "GRAND MONARCH"

Nothing in Europe could compare with such luxury, though foreign monarchs tried in vain to imitate it. Naturally enough French nobles flocked to this brilliant court, as moths gather round a flame. At Versailles they lived a life of show and extravagance, without performing any real services. Dukes and counts took pride in handing the King his wig, when he dressed, or his towel, when he bathed. The feudal nobles were becoming, like so many chandeliers, mere decorations for the King's palace, and they were costly decorations, too.

Patronage of Art and Literature. — Literary men and artists were no less eager to bask in the sunshine of the King's presence, and to receive pay and praise from the most lavish of all patrons. The great poets and dramatists, architects, sculptors, and painters, who gathered at Versailles, made Louis XIV's age the "classic" period of French literature and art.[1] In all matters of culture, as

[1] Among French writers of the period were the three great dramatists, Corneille, Molière, and Racine, as well as LaFontaine, the author of fables and tales, and Madame de Sévigné, the witty memoir-writer. See Chapter XXII, pp. 762–763.

well as in war and diplomacy, Versailles was the hub of the world, the envy and admiration of all Europe.

The King's Work. — An autocrat like Louis XIV did not live merely for pleasure and praise. "One reigns by work and for work," he declared. He read the reports of his agents and ambassadors, he presided over the councils of his chief ministers, he decided what policies should be followed, he made the laws, he appointed the intendants and other high officials.

Colbert, the Minister of Louis XIV. — In his choice of advisers, Louis XIV was notably fortunate, and above all in his appointment of Colbert (kŏl′bâr′) as "controller-general" and chief minister. Unlike most great statesmen of earlier times, Colbert was neither a nobleman nor a clergyman. He was the son of a merchant, and a shrewd business man himself.

Colbert's Financial Reform. — Colbert reformed French finances. He increased the King's revenue by discharging dishonest tax collectors and by imposing tariffs and other indirect taxes. At the same time he reduced the direct tax on land and thereby lessened the financial burdens of the farmers and other common people.

Colbert's Promotion of Industry. — Like the good business man he was, Colbert told Louis XIV that the power and greatness of the French King depended not solely on his army, but also on the wealth and prosperity of the French people, because after all the money to pay for the royal court and for the army must be raised by taxing the people and the people could not be taxed unless they were prosperous. Consequently the government should do everything in its power to assist business. With Louis XIV's approval, Colbert pursued this policy with fixed determination, like "a man of marble." Thanks to his efforts, inventors were rewarded, premiums or "bounties" were paid by the King to merchants who started new industries, workmen were invited to come to France from foreign countries, while native workmen were forbidden to leave the country. Seventeen holidays were abolished, so that there would be more time for work. Colbert's ideal was a busy state in which none would be idle.

Trade and Colonies. — Colbert believed that in order to become wealthy France must sell more goods to foreign countries than

she bought from them. Consequently, he tried to encourage domestic industries and to discourage imports. For example, he gave a "bounty" to Frenchmen who built ships in France, but levied a tax on ships purchased from foreigners. A high tariff was established to protect home manufactures. Elaborate regulations were issued, compelling French manufacturers to produce articles of fine quality, so that foreigners would be eager to buy French goods. Since colonies of France could be made to buy French manufactures and to supply the mother-country with raw materials, Colbert granted charters and even gave liberal sums of money to companies for the purpose of establishing French colonies in India, Africa, and America.[1] To promote trade within France, he constructed canals, improved the roads, and tried to abolish the tolls and taxes charged on goods transported from one province to another.

COLBERT

The Navy. — Colbert displayed great energy in building up a powerful French navy and making France a great sea-power. Under his direction, naval schools and arsenals were founded, warships were constructed, all French sailors were compelled to serve a certain period in the navy, and judges were instructed to sentence as many criminals as possible to serve as oarsmen in French warships.

Other Activities of Colbert. — Colbert also created academies to encourage science, architecture, and music. Moreover, he strengthened the system of intendants which Cardinal Richelieu had created. And with all his public duties, Colbert found time to look after his own interests so well that when he died in 1683,

[1] On these French colonies, see pp. 730, 735, 744.

after almost twenty years in office, he left an immense private fortune.

Defects in the Autocracy of Louis XIV. — Despite the magnificent appearance of the court of Louis XIV and despite the really great services of Colbert, French autocracy could hardly be permanent. Too much depended upon the will of the autocrat, upon the whim of one man. Louis XIV had unusual ability, but even Louis XIV was human. He was vain and conceited. He was too far removed from common men to understand and sympathize with their desires. He was too easily flattered by empty-headed courtiers who surrounded him at Versailles and too ready to accept their opinions. He could endure no opposition or criticism, and he was so intent on winning temporary glory for himself that he brought lasting evil upon France.

Religious Intolerance. — One unwise thing which Louis XIV did, shortly after the death of Colbert, was to deprive, by a single stroke of his pen, thousands of his subjects of their right to worship as they pleased. The French Protestants (Huguenots), who formed a small but influential minority of the French people, had been given important rights and privileges by the Edict of Nantes (1598), which we have already described.[1] This edict was arbitrarily revoked by Louis XIV in 1685. Thereby, royal autocracy removed France from leadership in the cause of religious toleration and at the same time undid much of Colbert's work in behalf of the economic welfare of France. Three hundred thousand or more French Huguenots, finding themselves shorn of their privileges and prevented from worshipping as they pleased, fled to England, Holland, and Prussia, and settled in those countries or else joined the armies of Louis XIV's foreign foes. As the Huguenots were mostly middle-class folk, merchants and skilled workmen, their emigration was a heavy blow to the prosperity of France.

Militarism. — A particularly dangerous thing which Louis XIV did, year after year, during most of his reign, was to waste the money and sacrifice the lives of his subjects in wars of conquest. He maintained a standing army of between three and four hundred thousand men, which was larger than the army of any other

[1] See p. 805.

country of his time. In Louvois (lōō′vwä′), his minister of war, the King had a military genius who organized, equipped and disciplined the army and made it ever ready for attack. In Vauban (vō′bäɴ′) the King had a distinguished engineer who built or repaired more than a hundred and sixty fortresses and conducted the siege of at least forty enemy strongholds. The King could also command the services of a number of first-class generals. But all this militarism cost money. In time it absorbed all the savings of Colbert, and in the end it impoverished France.

Foreign Policy of Louis XIV. — Louis XIV devoted much time and money to foreign policy. In this matter he had three principal purposes:

(1) *Securing "natural frontiers" for France.* — Louis XIV wished to enlarge the territory of France so that it would be as big as Gaul had been in the ancient Roman Empire and would extend, like Gaul, to the "natural frontiers" of the Pyrenees and Alps, the Mediterranean, the Atlantic, and the Rhine River.[1] The first four of these frontiers really did mark off France naturally from foreign countries, but the Rhine River was hardly a "natural" boundary for France. As a matter of fact, rivers tend to unite nations rather than to divide them, because river valleys usually serve as arteries of commerce and bonds of union. The Rhine valley had long been a bond of union for Germans rather than a line of separation between Frenchmen and Germans; and in order to extend France to the Rhine, the French King would have to include a good many Germans and Dutch in his realm. Yet he persisted in considering the Rhine a natural frontier and in laboring to obtain it.

(2) *Increasing the influence and power of the Bourbon family.* — Louis XIV, as the head of the Bourbon family, desired to obtain wealth and offices and even foreign thrones for other members of his family — for his children and his grandchildren. He was willing to use French diplomacy and the French army for family purposes.

(3) *Weakening the chief rival family in Europe, the Habsburgs.* — The Habsburgs had come into prominence a few centuries previ-

[1] On ancient Gaul, see pp. 296–299.

ously as rulers (archdukes) of Austria and then as Holy Roman Emperors.[1] Subsequently, by lucky marriages and clever diplomacy and some fighting, they had acquired other lands. When Louis XIV became King of France in 1643, one branch of the Habsburg family ruled Spain, together with part of Italy, the Spanish Netherlands (the region we now call Belgium), Franche Comté (frăNsh′-kôN′tā′, a district in what is now the eastern part of France), and the Spanish colonies in America. Another Habsburg ruler, closely related to the King of Spain, was at that time Archduke of Austria, King of Hungary, King of Bohemia (Czechoslovakia), and Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire. France was thus surrounded on the north, east, and south by possessions of the powerful Habsburg family.[2] Louis XIV disliked powerful neighbors and was especially envious of the Habsburg family. Besides, he knew that he could not increase the influence of the Bourbon family without humiliating the Habsburgs and that he could not secure the Rhine River as a "natural frontier" for France without taking away from the Habsburgs some of their territories. Consequently he directed his foreign policy mainly against the Habsburgs.

The Wars of Louis XIV. — (1) *The Thirty Years' War.* — When Louis XIV came to the throne, France, under the wily guidance of Cardinal Richelieu, had already become involved in the Thirty Years' War (1618–1648) on the side of the German Protestants, Sweden, and Holland against the Habsburgs of Austria and Spain. During the boyhood of the King, Cardinal Mazarin continued the policy of Cardinal Richelieu. The war with the Austrian Habsburgs was concluded by the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, by the terms of which the Holy Roman Empire was greatly weakened; the independence of the Dutch Netherlands (Holland) was recognized; and most of Alsace, on the west side of the upper Rhine, was ceded to France.[3] The war with the Spanish Habsburgs was concluded by the Treaty of the Pyrenees

[1] See pp. 578, 710–712.

[2] See the map opposite p. 811.

[3] On the Thirty Years' War and other provisions of the Treaty of Westphalia, see pp. 802–804.

GROWTH OF FRANCE, 1648–1768

in 1659, in accordance with which France acquired the province of Roussillon (rōō′sē′yôn′) near the Pyrenees and the province of Artois (ȧr′twä′) adjacent to the Spanish Netherlands (Belgium), and the young Louis XIV married the eldest daughter of the Habsburg King of Spain.

(2) *The War for the Spanish Netherlands* (*1667–1668*). — When the Habsburg King of Spain died, in 1665, Louis XIV claimed that his wife, and consequently he himself, should inherit the Spanish Netherlands (Belgium). In the war which ensued, the French troops were victorious until England, Holland, and Sweden came to the rescue of Spain and obliged Louis XIV to sign the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle (āks′-lȧ-shȧ′pĕl′, 1668). Thereby Spain surrendered the southern part of the Netherlands, including the city of Lille (lēl), to France, but retained the greater part of Belgium.

(3) *The War against the Dutch* (*1672–1678*). — Louis XIV next attacked the Dutch Netherlands (Holland) because he was angry that the Dutch had helped to prevent him from annexing Belgium, because he needed Dutch territory to extend France to the Rhine, and because of commercial rivalry between France and Holland. The Habsburg family, both of Austria and of Spain, was alarmed by the French King's attack and his military successes, and it made common cause with Holland. By the treaty of Nimwegen (1678) which ended the fighting, Holland preserved her territory and independence, but the Spanish Habsburgs were compelled to cede Franche Comté to France.

(4) *Seizure of Strasbourg* (*1681*) *and Luxemburg* (*1684*). — Louis XIV next laid claim to Strasbourg, a free city of the Holy Roman Empire in Alsace, and occupied it with his troops. Similarly he seized Luxemburg and several other German towns.

(5) *War of the Palatinate* (*1688–1697*). — In 1688 Louis XIV dispatched a large army into the Rhenish Palatinate to enforce a preposterous claim to that valuable district. This time the Habsburg Emperor had formed a league with Spain, Sweden, and several German princes in order to halt French advance toward the Rhine, and the Allies were able to make a stiff fight. With the advent of the Dutch William of Orange to the throne of

England in 1689,[1] England and Holland joined the Allies. After many years of strife, bad for all concerned, peace was made by the Treaty of Ryswick (1697). Louis XIV abandoned his claim to the Palatinate and gave back most of the towns he had seized since 1680, except Strasbourg.

(6) *War of the Spanish Succession (1702–1713).* — A few years later, Louis XIV thought he had a special opportunity to humble the Habsburgs, exalt the Bourbons, and secure the Rhine frontier for France. The last Habsburg King of Spain, a pitifully weak man, had no direct heirs and was prevailed upon by Louis XIV to will Spain and all the Spanish possessions to the grandson of Louis XIV (whose wife, it will be remembered, had been a Spanish Habsburg princess). But the Habsburgs of Austria insisted that they were the rightful successors to their close kinsmen, the Habsburgs of Spain; they refused to recognize the grandson of Louis XIV as King of Spain, and so a war was fought to determine the Spanish succession, to decide whether a Bourbon or a Habsburg should be King of Spain.

Only the Spaniards and the French supported Louis XIV in this war. All the other important nations of Europe — Austria, Prussia, England, Holland, Portugal, and Savoy — were arrayed against him. The war was protracted and destructive and deadly. The outcome, as determined by the Treaty of Utrecht (1713), was an absolute victory for no one. Louis XIV succeeded in seating his grandson and the Bourbon family on the throne of Spain, but only on condition that France and Spain should never be united and that Spain should cede to the Austrian Habsburgs her possessions in Italy and in the Netherlands (Belgium). For France, Louis XIV obtained nothing. He actually lost some of the French colonies in America to England.

Effects of the Wars of Louis XIV. — The "Grand Monarch" was only partially successful in his numerous foreign wars. By putting his grandson on the Spanish throne, he weakened Habsburg power. By annexing Alsace, Artois, Flanders, and Franche Comté, he enlarged France, though he still lacked a good deal of the territory up to the Rhine.

[1] See p. 818.

Was the game worth the candle? By conquering German Alsace, Louis XIV sowed the seeds of future conflict between France and Germany. By spending the strength of France on

DISTRIBUTION OF BREAD TO POOR PEOPLE IN PARIS, UNDER LOUIS XIV
Notice how the soldiers treat the people.

petty conquests in Europe, he sacrificed the opportunity to build up her commerce and colonies. Moreover, the millions he squandered in fighting needless wars and in maintaining a showy court burdened the French people with a crushing load of taxes. Famine and pestilence, as usual, went hand in hand with war. A more

peaceful France would have been a more prosperous France, and in the long run a more prosperous country would perhaps have been a greater country. Certainly it would have been a happier one.

Death of Louis XIV. — Louis XIV saw too late the terrible mistake he had made. On his deathbed, the old autocrat told his successor, "Do not imitate my fondness for building and for war, but work to lessen the misery of my people." He died in 1715 after reigning seventy-two years; his reign was the longest in history. So grievously had he made his people suffer, that when his corpse was carried through the streets, it "was saluted by the curses of a noisy crowd sitting in the wine-rooms, celebrating his death by drinking more than their fill as a compensation for having suffered too much from hunger during his lifetime." Such was the sorry end of the "Grand Monarch," the great champion of autocracy.

Decay of Autocracy in France. — With all his faults and foolish actions, Louis XIV was an able, hard-working monarch, served by competent, hard-working ministers. But his successor, Louis XV (1715–1774), was lazy and sought only his own pleasure, and his ministers had not the ability of a Richelieu or a Colbert. The pomp of the court of Versailles was kept up, and wars continued to be waged for the glory of the Bourbon family. But the wars of Louis XV, like the wars of Louis XIV, were more and more disastrous for France. Autocracy was rotting in France during the eighteenth century. Under Louis XVI (1774–1793) it came to a violent and tragic end in a great revolution, the story of which belongs to Modern History.

The Great Powers of the Eighteenth Century

Great Powers. — By the eighteenth century, certain countries in Europe had become so strong and important and were so active in diplomacy and war that they were called "Great Powers." If one of them threatened to become too strong, several others would unite against it in order to maintain a "Balance of Power." Frequently the "Great Powers" strengthened themselves at the expense of smaller and weaker countries, the "Lesser Powers."

All the "Great Powers," except England, were ruled by autocratic sovereigns in the eighteenth century, and autocracy tended to make them militaristic and warlike.

France. — France, under the autocratic Bourbons, was certainly a Great Power. Indeed, under Louis XIV (1643–1715), she was the leading Great Power in Europe, though, as we have seen, other Great Powers combined against her during the latter part of the reign of the Grand Monarch. Under Louis XV (1715–1774) and Louis XVI (1774–1792), France continued to be recognized as a Great Power, but her power and prestige gradually dwindled.

England. — England, under the Stuart Kings of the seventeenth century, and particularly after her Glorious Revolution of 1688, was a Great Power. The extension of her trade and overseas colonies during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries made her the chief commercial and colonial and naval Power in the world. Unlike the Great Powers on the continent of Europe, England was ruled in the eighteenth century not by an autocratic King but by an aristocratic Parliament and by a Cabinet and Prime Minister. The Whig party managed affairs during the reigns of George I (1714–1727) and George II (1727–1760); and although George III (1760–1820) tried to exert a little more of his personal influence on politics, he had to rely upon the Tory party and was really dependent on Parliament. Yet England, in spite of the decline of autocracy and the rise of Parliament at home, was involved in almost all the wars which autocrats of other Great Powers waged with one another during the eighteenth century.

Austria. — Austria, under the autocratic Habsburgs, was certainly a Great Power. For to the small German state of Austria had been added, in the sixteenth century, Bohemia (Czechoslovakia) and Hungary; and the ruler of the resulting large state in central Europe also enjoyed the honor (though little additional power went with it) of being elected Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire. Early in the eighteenth century (1713), as an outcome of the War of the Spanish Succession, which we have already described, Austria obtained Belgium and important possessions in Italy.

Decline of Former Great Powers. — *Spain,* which had been a Great Power in the sixteenth century under Philip II,[1] continued long afterwards to pose as a Great Power and participated in all the major wars of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Thanks to her rich and extensive colonial empire in America and the Philippines, she remained a commercial and colonial rival of England's; but on the continent of Europe her importance lessened and in the eighteenth century she was not to be reckoned as a Great Power.

In the seventeenth century, three other countries — Holland, Sweden, and Poland — gave promise of becoming Great Powers. But *Holland,* after defeating Spain and acquiring a colonial empire, fell a prey to internal dissensions and foreign attacks; she lost some of her colonies, and in the eighteenth century became clearly a "Lesser Power." *Sweden,* after embarking on a career of conquest under King Gustavus Adolphus (1611–1632)[2] and transforming the Baltic Sea into a Swedish lake, suffered serious reverses and setbacks, as we shall presently see, in the eighteenth century. And *Poland,* as we shall also see presently, actually disappeared from the map in the eighteenth century.

Rise of New Great Powers. — Two other countries emerged as Great Powers in the eighteenth century. They were *Russia* and *Prussia.* It is important that we know something about each.

Russia and Peter the Great. — While Louis XIV was dazzling the world with the splendor of his autocratic court and winning for France the proud position of the foremost Power in Western Europe, another remarkable monarch was welding together a huge autocratic state in Eastern Europe. This monarch was Peter I, usually called "the Great," who reigned as Tsar of Russia from 1682 to 1725.

What Peter Started with. — Russia had developed from the medieval Duchy of Muscovy, originally a small state centering in the town of Moscow. It had gradually expanded northward to the White Sea, southward to the Caspian Sea, and eastward into Siberia. In the sixteenth century one of the Dukes of Muscovy

[1] See pp. 801–802. [2] See p. 803.

had taken the title of Tsar of Russia, and after his family had died out, the Russian nobles in 1613 elected one of their number, with the family-name of Romanov (rō-mä′nŏf), to be Tsar.

Peter the Great belonged to the Romanov family, and when he became Tsar, he found himself the ruler of a domain almost as large as the United States to-day. But Russia was then sparsely populated and had few contacts with Western Europe. It was poor and backward. It had little foreign commerce, because it had no outlet on either the Baltic or the Black Sea. Its people, in their manners and customs, were more like Asiatics than like Europeans. The Tsar, moreover, was not an absolute ruler; he was limited by the power and influence of the nobility and the Orthodox Church and also by the independence of his armed bodyguard.

PETER THE GREAT

Peter the Great. — Peter was a good deal of a barbarian himself. He was hot-tempered and cruel, he drank much brandy, and he usually appeared with dirty clothes and a red nose. But he had brains, a strong will, and tireless energy. As a youth he had a hobby of building boats, and, in order to learn more about ships and to satisfy his general curiosity, he travelled through Western Europe. There he became convinced of the need of "Europeanizing" Russia, that is, of introducing into Russia the manners and customs and the form of autocratic government then prevalent in the West. With fierce determination he devoted his reign to the double task of Europeanizing Russia and making it an autocratic Great Power.

Establishment of Autocracy in Russia. — Peter the Great lost no opportunity to strengthen his authority and make himself an

absolute autocrat. He solemnly declared: "The Tsar is sovereign and autocratic; he is responsible to no one in the world." No Stuart or Bourbon King could have claimed more. And Peter the Great made good his claim.

The Army. — One obstacle to autocracy had been that former Tsars could not count on the loyalty of the old feudal army, especially of their bodyguards. While on his travels, Peter received word that his bodyguard had disobeyed him and was planning to dethrone him. Furiously angry, he hurried back to Moscow to teach the members of the bodyguard a lesson. Some of them he whipped; two thousand were either hanged or broken on the wheel (a particularly cruel method of execution); five thousand were beheaded. Peter took a grim pleasure in slicing off heads of rebellious soldiers with his own royal arm.

In place of the old bodyguard and feudal army, the Tsar created a new army of two hundred thousand men, officered and disciplined by foreigners who could be relied upon to do whatever he commanded. With a loyal army, Peter could safely proceed with other reforms.

The Church. — Another obstacle to autocracy had been the power of the Russian Orthodox Church. The Orthodox Church in Russia had become independent of the Patriarch of Constantinople about a century before,[1] and was now governed by the Patriarch of Moscow, who was elected by the clergy. The Church had so much influence over the Russian people that Peter was unwilling to let it remain independent. Consequently he abolished the office of Patriarch and entrusted the government of the Church to a committee, called the Holy Synod, the ordinary members of which were bishops chosen by himself and the chairman of which was a layman likewise appointed by the Tsar. As a result, the Russian Church was thenceforth a faithful supporter of the Tsar. Autocracy used religion to strengthen itself.

Reorganization of Government. — Peter introduced autocracy into the civil government of the country, as well as into its army and Church. He abolished the Duma, a kind of medieval parliament

[1] On the Patriarch of Constantinople, see pp. 502–505, and on the Orthodox Church in Russia, see pp. 507–508.

somewhat like England's, and in its place established a small advisory council appointed by the Tsar. He also created a secret police to ferret out conspiracies against him and his agents. And he brought the local government of the whole Empire more thoroughly under his own control.

"Europeanizing" of Russia. — *Manners and Customs.* — Peter was resolved to make his subjects look like Europeans rather than like Asiatics. For example, since long beards were more common in Asia and Russia than in Western Europe, the Tsar solemnly assembled the chief men of Russia and with his own hand cut off their long beards and luxuriant mustaches; and he imposed a heavy fine on any man who insisted upon wearing a beard. Next, he ordered the men of the upper classes to exchange their long Eastern cloaks for jackets and hose of English or German style, and compelled his courtiers to imitate the fashions of the French court at Versailles. Like it or not, Russian noblemen had to learn the use of tobacco. Ladies, moreover, were no longer to be secluded from gentlemen in Turkish manner, but must participate in the festivities of the palace.

Science and Education. — The schools which Peter founded were few in number, and were chiefly for the practical purpose of training engineers, sailors, army officers, etc., but they marked the first introduction of Western science and education into Russia. Similarly, by importing skilled workmen from the West and by establishing shops for the manufacture of military and naval supplies, Peter gave an impetus to industry in Russia.

Open Ports for Russia. — The Russian Empire which Peter the Great inherited was, as has already been pointed out, almost completely cut off from the open sea. To be sure, it had outlets on the Caspian Sea and on the White Sea, but the former is merely an inland lake, while the latter is blocked by ice during a large part of the year. Peter knew that if Russia were to be "Europeanized" and to become a prosperous European Power it would have to develop commerce with the West and that for this purpose it would be necessary to gain outlets on the Black and Baltic Seas. "Windows to the West," he called them.

From the Baltic, as a glance at the map will show, Peter was

Northern and Eastern Europe in the Time of Peter the Great

barred by the Swedish possessions of Finland, Esthonia, and Latvia. Sweden was then one of the strongest kingdoms in Europe. The Baltic was practically a Swedish lake. Sweden would be one of Peter's enemies. The other would be the Empire of the Ottoman Turks, because the Turkish Sultan's sway extended over all the coastlands, north as well as south, of the Black Sea, completely excluding Russia from its waters. Against the Turks, Peter the Great made little headway. But against Sweden he was more successful.

The Great Northern War between Russia and Sweden (1699–1721). — Peter made an alliance with Poland and Denmark and attacked Sweden. The Swedish King at the time was Charles XII, who was hardly more than a boy but a boy filled with an insane ambition to be as mighty a warrior as Alexander the Great had been of old. Charles XII at first won some amazing victories. He crushed Denmark, defeated Peter's Russian army in the battle of Narva, and overwhelmed Poland. But, while Poland and Denmark made an humiliating peace with the youthful Swedish conqueror, Peter raised a new army and stubbornly continued the war. At Poltava (pŏl-tä′vä), in 1709, Peter destroyed the army of Charles XII, and obliged the Swedish King to take refuge with the Turks. After the death of Charles XII, Sweden made peace by the Treaty of Nystad, ceding to Russia a large area on the eastern coast of the Baltic, including Esthonia and Latvia, together with a narrow strip of southern Finland. Peter had indeed opened a "window to the West," and a generous one.

Foundation of St. Petersburg. — Even before his conquest had been formally recognized, Peter had founded a new city on the Neva River, at the head of the Gulf of Finland, in one of the provinces captured from Sweden. This new city was named St. Petersburg (later re-named "Petrograd," and still later "Leningrad"). It was made by Peter the Great the chief commercial port and the capital of Russia. In it he erected magnificent palaces and other buildings resembling those of the Bourbon Kings of France at Versailles. St. Petersburg was to be a "Western" city, a symbol that Russia, under Peter the Great, was being Europeanized and was becoming a Great Power.

Russia as a Great Power under Catherine II. — The work begun by Peter the Great was continued with special ability by one of his successors, Catherine II (1762–1796). This Catherine II was a German woman by birth, coarse and immoral; she put to death the Tsar who was her husband and seized the throne herself. She was, however, devoted to Russia and proved herself so capable that she has gone down in history as Catherine the Great.

CATHERINE THE GREAT

Catherine the Great, like Peter the Great, reigned as an absolute autocrat. She dominated the army, the Church, and the civil government. At the same time she developed commercial and intellectual contacts with Western Europe. Also she waged successful foreign wars and greatly enlarged the Russian Empire.

Just as Peter the Great in the first quarter of the eighteenth century devoted his chief foreign efforts to humbling and despoiling Sweden, so Catherine the Great in the second half of the eighteenth century sought Russian expansion at the expense of Turkey and Poland. She defeated the Turks and forced them in 1774 to cede to her the north shore of the Black Sea. She interfered constantly in the internal affairs of Poland; from this country she took a large slice of territory in 1772, and another in 1793; the third slice, which she took in 1795, erased Poland as an independent nation from the map of Europe.

Rise of Prussia. — Russia was one of two European countries which became Great Powers in the eighteenth century. Prussia was the other. Prussia was a German country.

The country of Prussia originated through a union in 1618, under the Hohenzollern family, of the Electorate of Brandenburg

with the Duchy of Prussia. The Electorate of Brandenburg was one of the more important states in the Holy Roman Empire,[1] while the Duchy of Prussia was the state which lay between Poland and the Baltic and which had been converted to Christianity and made German during the Middle Age by Crusades of the Teutonic Knights.[2]

It has already been pointed out that the Holy Roman Empire was greatly weakened by the Thirty Years' War (1618–1648). This meant that the Habsburg Emperors ceased to have any real control over the Empire and that each state in the Empire became practically free and independent. Thereby the Hohenzollern family was enabled to get rid of domination by the Habsburgs of Austria and to make Prussia a Great Power.

Frederick William, the Great Elector. — The Hohenzollern rulers of Prussia in the seventeenth century bore the title of Elector of Brandenburg, and one of them, Frederick William (1640–1688), was so important that he is known in history as the "Great Elector." He profited from the Thirty Years' War not only by weakening the Habsburgs of Austria but also by enlarging his territories[3] and strengthening his army. For the internal government of his country the Great Elector, like the Stuarts in England and like Louis XIV in France, was a firm believer in autocracy. When he came to the throne he found Brandenburg-Prussia a constitutional state, in which laws were made jointly by the Elector and a Parliament (called a Diet). By means similar to those employed by the Bourbon Kings of France, he changed all this, so that at his death he left Prussia to his successors substantially an absolute and "divine-right" monarchy.

Creation of the Kingdom of Prussia. — At the beginning of the eighteenth century, the Great Elector's son and successor, Frederick I, obtained from the Habsburg Emperor the right to call himself *King* in Prussia (1701). Henceforth the expression "Kingdom of Prussia" was popularly applied to all the lands ruled by the Hohenzollerns, and the name of Brandenburg ceased to be used.

King Frederick William I. — The son of Frederick I and grandson of the Great Elector Frederick William was King Frederick

[1] See pp. 573, 579, 804. [2] See p. 580. [3] See p. 803.

William I (1713–1740). He was a shrewd and zealous autocrat, bent upon forcing all his subjects to work and very proud of his army. He made Prussia a thoroughly military state. Though ranking only twelfth among European states in extent and population, Prussia under King Frederick William was already fourth in military power. Its standing army of 85,000 men absorbed five-sevenths of the country's revenue. Besides, it was chiefly for



How Disobedient Prussian Soldiers Were Punished

military purposes that the King made elementary education compulsory in Prussia. A little education, he believed, would produce better soldiers. At the same time the King promoted the prosperity of the country. He believed that the more prosperous the country was, the larger army it could support.

King Frederick William I used his army less to fight than to threaten his neighbors, and by diplomacy as much as by war he added to Prussia certain Swedish territories south of the Baltic. It remained to his son and successor, Frederick II, to put the Prussian army and Prussian autocracy fully in action. This Frederick II is known in history as Frederick the Great.



GROWTH OF PRUSSIA TO 1797

Frederick the Great. — Frederick the Great (1740–1786) was the greatest of the Hohenzollerns. He was rather short and had bright blue eyes and a long thin nose. In his youth he had been thought effeminate because he showed a taste for music, poetry, and dancing, and he had been rigidly disciplined by his stern father. But throughout his reign he displayed two principal qualities — a vaulting ambition for fame and glory through war and conquest, and an eager desire to be an "enlightened" autocrat.

His Conquests. — Frederick, with the large and well-drilled army and with the full treasury which his father had left him, began his reign by seizing from Maria Theresa, the young heiress to the Habsburg possessions, the rich and populous German province of Silesia (the upper valley of the Oder River, including the city of Breslau). To keep Silesia, Frederick had to fight two long and terrible wars, lasting together some fifteen years.[1] But he was a military genius; he won the wars, against great odds; and Prussia kept Silesia.

Later, Frederick joined Catherine II of Russia and Maria Theresa of Austria in interfering in the internal affairs of Poland and in dividing up this unfortunate country (1772). By his appropriation of a part of Poland and by his conquest of Silesia, Frederick rounded out the boundaries of Prussia and assured to Prussia a position as a Great Power on an equal footing with Austria, Russia, France, and England.

Frederick as an "Enlightened" Despot. — In the latter part of the eighteenth century almost every monarch on the Continent of Europe was not only autocratic and despotic, but "enlightened" as well. All these sovereigns took very seriously the business of ruling, and tried to be intelligent and reasonable about it and to promote the welfare of their subjects. Frederick the Great, for example, regarded himself as "the first servant of the state." "The people do not exist for the sake of the rulers," he wrote, "but the rulers for the sake of the people." He worked hard. He rose before six every morning, devoting himself to public affairs.

He did many things for the welfare of his people. (1) He filled the public offices with capable and loyal men, and guaranteed

[1] See pp. 849–852.

their good behavior by supervising them most carefully. (2) He did much for the economic development of Prussia, especially for agriculture. (3) He prepared an up-to-date code of law and treated criminals with greater justice and kindness. (4) He allowed religious freedom to his subjects. (5) He promoted education and science.

Commerce, Colonies, and Wars of the Eighteenth Century

Dynastic Wars. — While autocracy was declining in England and was still very active in France and Austria and was rising in Russia and Prussia, the Great Powers of Europe, in the latter part of the seventeenth century and throughout the eighteenth century, waged numerous wars with one another and against Lesser Powers. Most of these wars on the continent of Europe were the result of the ambitions of reigning autocratic families — the Bourbons of France, the Habsburgs of Austria, the Hohenzollerns of Prussia, and the Romanovs of Russia — to enlarge their territories and to increase their prestige. Such wars were "dynastic" wars (that is, "family" wars) of the Great Powers.

Complicated by Colonial Wars. — The "dynastic" wars were complicated, however, by struggles which were waged simultaneously by some of the Great Powers of Europe (including England) in America, India, and on the oceans about commerce and colonies. In order to understand these colonial and commercial wars, which reached their climax in the eighteenth century, it is necessary to recall what the colonies were and why they became bones of contention for countries of Western Europe.

European Colonies in 1689. — In an earlier chapter, we have explained how colonies were obtained by Spain and Portugal in the sixteenth century and by Holland, France, and England in the seventeenth century.[1] By 1689, Spain had well-established colonies in South America, Central America, Mexico, Florida, the West Indies, and the Philippine Islands. Portugal held Brazil and trading posts on the coasts of Africa and India. Holland controlled the East Indies and owned colonies in South Africa and in the West Indies. England had a string of colonies

[1] See Chapter XXI, pp. 726, 729, 731, 735, 740–749.

along the Atlantic coast of North America from Massachusetts to South Carolina and trading posts in India and in the West Indies. France was colonizing Canada and the Mississippi Valley in America and was establishing trading posts in India.

Why Colonies Were Valued. — There were several reasons why the nations of Western Europe were so eager to acquire colonies. One was the desire of ambitious rulers and patriotic statesmen to gain more territory, just for the sake of ruling over larger dominions. Another reason — at least in some cases — was religion; a pious monarch might consider it a privilege and a duty to bring heathen lands under Christian rule (this was especially true of the Spanish, Portuguese, and French monarchs); or persons who suffered religious persecution at home might seek religious freedom for themselves in colonies abroad (this was the case with Puritans and Catholics in England). Moreover, when one King saw his neighbors helping themselves to colonies, he naturally felt an impulse to follow their example and get as much as possible for himself. But by far the most important reason was the belief of Kings and statesmen that the possession of colonies would increase the wealth and power of the mother-country. This belief was based on a general policy called "mercantilism."

Mercantilism. — Mercantilism was the economic policy pursued during the Era of Transition by many rulers, for example, by Louis XIV and his minister Colbert, and by the Stuart Kings in England. Essentially it was the outgrowth of autocracy; it was the substitution of the power of an autocratic King for the power of the gilds and towns to regulate and protect business. In each National State the King sought to promote the wealth of his own country, partly in order to increase his own revenues (from taxes on commerce, etc.), and sometimes partly to win favor with the middle classes. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries Spain and France were the two great examples of autocratic mercantilism.

England had been practically an autocracy when she began to found colonies and to practice mercantilism, but as an outcome of her seventeenth-century revolutions she became a limited monarchy. Nevertheless, she continued to practice mercantilism,

more successfully and vigorously than before. Holland likewise followed mercantilist policies, although the Dutch government in the seventeenth century was a kind of aristocratic republic,[1] rather than an autocracy.

Mercantilism and Trade. — The primary purpose of mercantilism was to increase the wealth of the nation, rather than of individual citizens. The economic freedom of individual citizens was restricted in order to promote national wealth. For this purpose, Colbert and other mercantilists tried to promote manufactures and exports of manufactured goods by adopting protective tariffs, by forbidding imports of goods that could be produced at home, by granting bounties (premiums) to manufacturers in new industries, and by issuing very elaborate trade regulations. By such means, it was thought, a nation could maintain a "favorable balance of trade," that is, a surplus of exports over imports. As one English writer said: "The means to increase our wealth and treasure is by Forraign Trade, wherein wee must ever observe this rule: to sell more to strangers than wee consume of theirs in value." By selling more than it bought, the country would increase its hoard of gold and silver, which were erroneously considered the true measures of a nation's wealth.

Mercantilism and Sea-Power. — In addition, to protect its trade and increase its power, each nation should strive to build up a strong navy and a large fleet of merchant vessels. In those days, navies consisted of wooden sailing vessels armed with small cannon, and merchant vessels could easily be used as warships in time of need. Shipping and sea-power therefore went hand in hand, and both were considered vitally necessary.

Mercantilism and Colonies. — From the mercantilist standpoint colonies also were supremely important. From her colonies, for instance, Spain could obtain gold and silver. Even colonies without rich mines could at least provide the mother-country

[1] This was the situation in Holland (that is, in the Dutch Netherlands) after the overthrow of Spanish rule in 1581. The executive power of the Dutch Republic, in the seventeenth century, was vested most of the time in a Prince of the House of Orange, styled a "stadholder." In the eighteenth century this office was rendered hereditary, and Holland became practically a limited monarchy like England.

with raw materials, or with goods which could be sold for gold and silver; and the colonies and natives could buy the mother-country's manufactures. Each nation tried to monopolize the trade of its own colonies. Thus Spain decreed that only Spaniards could trade with the Spanish colonies, while England in the seventeenth century adopted Navigation Acts requiring that goods carried to or from the English colonies must be shipped in English vessels.

Mercantilism a Cause of Colonial Wars. — The general adoption of mercantilism meant that the only way in which one colonial Power could trade with the colonies of another was to conquer them or to force the mother-country to change its trade laws. Consequently, intense rivalry existed among the colonial Powers, and the rivalry was seldom friendly. Often it led to war. In fact, there began at the close of the seventeenth century (about 1689) a series of gigantic colonial wars, which lasted through the greater part of the eighteenth century, and upon which the destinies of whole continents depended. In most of these wars autocratic France and Spain were arrayed against non-autocratic England and Holland.

Fusion of Colonial Wars with Dynastic Wars. — By 1689 the commercial and colonial ambitions of England came into particularly sharp conflict with those of France. In that year, England and Holland became allied, as we have seen,[1] through the "Glorious" Revolution and the accession of the head of the Dutch Republic, Prince William of Orange and his wife, Mary, to the throne of England. At the same time King Louis XIV of France was trying, as we have seen,[2] to extend his country's frontier to the Rhine River and to secure additional glory for the Bourbon family by attacking the Habsburgs of Austria and Spain and conquering the Palatinate. Now the autocratic Louis XIV did not like the Revolution which had destroyed autocracy in England and had put William and Mary on the English throne, and the English as well as the Dutch were now fearful of Louis XIV. Consequently England and Holland joined the Habsburgs of Austria and Spain and other European monarchs in the *War of the Palatinate* (1689–1697) against France. And while the war raged

[1] See pp. 818, 830–831. [2] See pp. 827–830.

on the continent of Europe, fighting occurred between English and French colonists in America. Indeed, the War of the Palatinate is known in America as *King William's War*. It marked the first stage in a long struggle between England and France for colonial and commercial supremacy, a struggle which lasted, with some interruptions, from 1689 to 1783, and which is sometimes called the Second Hundred Years' War.[1]

War of the Spanish Succession; Queen Anne's War. — The second stage of the Second Hundred Years' War was a phase of the dynastic conflict for the throne of Spain between the Bourbons and the Habsburgs, which is known as the War of the Spanish Succession (1701–1713) and which has already been described.[2] Again England and Holland joined the Habsburgs against the Bourbon King Louis XIV of France, but this time Spain accepted the Bourbon grandson of Louis XIV as her King and therefore made common cause with France. For this reason, the fighting on the high seas and in America (where the struggle was known as Queen Anne's War) was between England and Holland, on the one side, and France and Spain, on the other.

The provisions of the Treaty of Utrecht, which concluded this war, have already been explained in so far as they affected the dynastic interests of Bourbons and Habsburgs.[2] Concerning colonies and commerce, the Treaty provided: (1) France ceded to England the American colony of Acadia, which was given the new name of Nova Scotia, and from which the French colonists were later expelled;[3] (2) France recognized England's claim to Newfoundland and the territory around Hudson's Bay; (3) Spain ceded to England the island of Minorca (in the Mediterranean) and the exceedingly valuable fortress and naval base of Gibraltar; and (4) Spain permitted England to carry on a limited trade with the Spanish colonies in America. It will be noted that England made significant commercial and colonial gains at the expense of France and Spain.

[1] For the first Hundred Years' War, which lasted from 1338 to 1453, see pp. 694–702.

[2] See p. 831.

[3] It was concerning the expulsion of these French colonists from Acadia that Longfellow wrote his famous poem, "Evangeline."

NORTH AMERICA IN 1750

War of the Austrian Succession; King George's War. — In 1740, as we have seen,[1] the Hohenzollern King of Prussia, Frederick the Great, attacked the Habsburg ruler of Austria, Maria Theresa, and seized the rich province of Silesia. At the same time the question was raised whether Maria Theresa, a woman, could properly inherit the Habsburg possessions. Her father, it is true, had issued a decree (called a "Pragmatic Sanction") asserting her right to succeed him, and before his death he had obtained the consent of all the European Powers to it. But now that he was dead, some of the European autocrats thought they could take advantage of a woman and divide up the inheritance of the Austrian Habsburgs as they had recently settled that of the Spanish Habsburgs. For this reason the Bourbon Kings of France and Spain joined the Hohenzollern King of Prussia against Austria. But to preserve the balance of power on the Continent of Europe and to make further gains in commerce and colonies at the expense of France and Spain, England and Holland joined Austria. The resulting struggle is known in Europe as the War of the Austrian Succession (1740–1748) and in America as King George's War.

The war was destructive but not decisive. By the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle (1748) Frederick the Great retained Silesia but Maria Theresa kept all the other Habsburg possessions; France and Spain gained nothing, and England kept her earlier conquests.

The Seven Years' War; the French and Indian War. — Maria Theresa, anxious to recover Silesia for Austria, proceeded to form an alliance with France and with Russia against Frederick the Great of Prussia. But so intense was the colonial and commercial rivalry between England and France that England, which had supported Austria in the previous war, now supported Prussia. War broke out in Europe in 1756 and was fought fiercely for seven years (1756–1763). Austrian, French, and Russian armies invaded Prussia, and for some time it seemed as though Prussia would be crushed and partitioned. But Frederick the Great was aided by financial assistance from England, by his own military genius, and by a considerable amount of luck. The Austrians and

[1] See p. 843.

the French were defeated in turn; and the Russians withdrew from the war when the husband of Catherine the Great, a friend of Prussia, became Tsar of Russia.

In America the conflict was called the French and Indian War. It began in 1754, when the French captured Fort Duquesne (dŏŏ-kān′) which English colonists had built on the spot where the city of Pittsburgh now stands. England replied by sending General Braddock with 3000 regular soldiers from the mother-country to recapture the place. Braddock's troops, unfortunately for them, were used to European battlefields, and when they were assailed in the midst of an American forest by unseen French and Indian sharpshooters, and heard the blood-curdling war-whoops of the savages, they broke into terror-stricken flight, leaving behind them a thousand dead and wounded.



William Pitt, Earl of Chatham

The following years witnessed campaigns in America on a scale far surpassing anything in previous colonial wars. The French now had about 60,000 colonists (and various friendly Indian tribes) to draw on; the British, almost 2,000,000 colonists besides reinforcements from across the ocean. Amazing as it may seem, the French, though vastly outnumbered, were so superior in military organization and energy that at first they were able to carry the war into the enemy's country.

In 1757, however, one of the ablest of all English statesmen, the famous William Pitt (Earl of Chatham), became head of the English cabinet and aroused his countrymen both at home and in the colonies to put forth a supreme effort. Soon British regular and colonial armies were on their way to capture the French forts

of Louisburg, Duquesne (renamed Fort Pitt, whence comes the name Pittsburgh), Niagara, and Ticonderoga. British warships conveyed General Wolfe with 7000 men up the St. Lawrence to attack Quebec. This was indeed a difficult undertaking, because the heights on which the fortress of Quebec stood were held by a large garrison. Only by leading his men, under cover of darkness, up a steep bank to the plateau behind the city and then defeating the surprised defenders in a pitched battle, did Wolfe succeed in carrying the fortress. Thrice wounded, he lived just long enough to hear the shout, "They run," and to be informed that it was not the English but the French who ran. After Wolfe's victory at Quebec (1759), the conquest of Montreal and other French strongholds in America was comparatively easy.



Robert Clive

In the meantime, the French and English were in conflict in India. The Mogul Empire of India, which had culminated in the reign of Aurangzeb (1658–1707), was falling into ruin; native princes were rebelling; and over the ruins of the Empire French and English traders quarrelled.[1] Just before the outbreak of the Seven Years' War in Europe, an ambitious official of the French East India Company, Dupleix (dü′plĕks′) by name, raised an army of "sepoys," or native soldiers, and began to interfere in the affairs of the native states. Soon he succeeded by skillful diplomacy in putting on the thrones of two important states upstart princes who would do his will, with the result that through them he could control most of southern India. Thanks to Dupleix, France seemed in a fair way to obtain political mastery of the whole peninsula.

[1] See pp. 731–735.

More than a match for Dupleix at the crafty game of setting up puppet princes was Robert Clive, an official of the English East India Company. In 1751 he managed to substitute a pro-English prince for a pro-French prince on the throne of an important native state in the south of India. Dupleix returned to France in disgrace. Subsequently, by the battle of Plassey (1757) Clive overcame the French and the natives in Bengal, and before the end of the Seven Years' War the English were in possession of all the French trading-posts throughout India.

Too late to be of real help, the Bourbon King of Spain in 1761 came to the aid of his cousin, the Bourbon King of France, and tried unsuccessfully to turn the tide of war against England in America and on the high seas.

The Treaties of Peace of 1763. — The dynastic war on the continent of Europe was brought to a close by Maria Theresa's sorrowful recognition that Austria was unable to recover Silesia from Prussia. The parallel colonial war was ended with the Treaty of Paris, which left France with only a few pitiful fragments of the extensive colonies which had once been hers. A few small islands in the New World, a foothold on the African coast, and half a dozen insignificant posts in India were all that remained to France. To her rival, England, was transferred the entire St. Lawrence Valley ("New France," or Canada), together with the whole region between the Appalachians and the Mississippi. Western "Louisiana," that is, the western half of the Mississippi Valley, was ceded by France to Spain as compensation for Florida, which Spain had to yield to England. In India, though the French returned to some of their former posts, it was as peaceful merchants, powerless to oppose the rapidly growing strength of the English. In short, England became by the Seven Years' War not only the mistress of the seas but also the greatest of all colonial Powers.

Indirect Effects of the Dynastic and Colonial Wars. — (1) *The Decline of Autocracy in France and Spain.* — The principle of autocratic government was discredited and weakened, to some extent in Spain, and to a large extent in France. The autocrats of these countries in the eighteenth century were uniformly unsuccessful in every war they undertook. The French Kings, Louis XIV and

Scale of miles
0 50 100 200 300
Boundary of the Holy Roman Empire
NORTH SEA
BALTIC SEA
SCOTLAND
Edinburgh
IRELAND
Dublin
ENGLAND
London
SWEDEN
Copenhagen
DENMARK
GOTHLAND
BORNHOLM
RÜGEN
Riga
Königsberg
PRUSSIA
Vilna
RUSSIA
Dnieper R.
Dniester R.
To Russia 1772
To Prussia 1772
To Austria 1772
To Austria 1795
Warsaw
Cracow
Lemberg
Posen
Berlin
Hanover
Bremen
Amsterdam
The Hague
DUTCH NETHERLANDS
Ostend
Brussels
Cologne
Cassel
Dresden
Prague
Mainz
SAXONY
SILESIA
BRANDENBURG
POMERANIA
MECKLENBURG
HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE
Le Havre
Brest
Verdun
Metz
Valmy
Paris
Strasbourg
WÜRTTEMBERG
Vienna
Presburg
Budapest
MORAVIA
AUSTRIA
BOHEMIA
Munich
TYROL
CARINTHIA
Nantes
Loire R.
FRANCE
Bordeaux
Lyons
Bern
SWITZERLAND
SAVOY
Rhone R.
Garonne R.
Bay of Biscay
Orange
Bayonne
NAVARRE
BISCAY
Marseilles
Toulon
Nice
PIEDMONT
Genoa
Venice
Verona
Milan
Florence
TUSCANY
Rome
Naples
NAPLES
KINGDOM OF THE TWO SICILIES
CORSICA
SARDINIA
Cagliari
MINORCA
MAJORCA
IVISA
Barcelona
Tortosa
Saragossa
CATALONIA
Valencia
Madrid
SPAIN
Douro R.
Tagus R.
Guadiana R.
Guadalquivir R.
Lisbon
PORTUGAL
Seville
Gibraltar (Br.)
ATLANTIC OCEAN
MEDITERRANEAN SEA
ADRIATIC SEA
Danube R.
Theiss R.
HUNGARY
TRANSYLVANIA
WALLACHIA
Bucharest
MOLDAVIA
Jassy
BLACK SEA
Varna
BULGARIA
Sofia
Adrianople
Constantinople
Bruss
Salonica
Janina
Smyrna
GREECE
CRETE
SERBIA
BOSNIA
MONTENEGRO
Scutari
ALBANIA
OTTOMAN EMPIRE
Agram
Longitude West
Longitude East from Greenwich
AFRICA
Wms. Eng. Co., N.Y.

EUROPE, 1775

Louis XV, gained little by their dynastic wars on the Continent of Europe,[1] and through their colonial wars they lost to Parliamentary England bit by bit almost all the possessions of France in America and India. Besides, to pay for their unsuccessful wars, they saddled France with a huge public debt and with a crushing burden of taxation. No wonder that a great democratic revolution broke out in France in 1789, and soon spread to Spain. But that is a landmark of Modern History.

(2) *The Partition of Poland and the Prolonging of Autocracy in Prussia and Russia.* — Prussia and Russia became autocratic Great Powers after France and Spain and were more successful than the latter in wars of the eighteenth century. Prussia, under Frederick the Great, won wars against Austria and France and conquered Silesia. Russia under Peter the Great defeated Sweden and expanded to the Baltic and then under Catherine the Great defeated the Ottoman Empire and expanded to the Black Sea. The autocrats of both states were absolutely unscrupulous.

It was the misfortune of the country which lay between Prussia and Russia — Poland — to be a weak limited monarchy and an easy prey to its autocratic neighbors. In 1764 — the year after the conclusion of the Seven Years' War — Catherine the Great of Russia intervened in Poland and obliged the Polish Parliament to elect a friend of hers as King. Thenceforth the Tsarina never missed a chance to stir up strife among the Poles and to make aggressions at their expense; and the Prussian King, who had already robbed Austria of Silesia, lived up to his reputation by helping Catherine rob Poland. In 1772 was arranged the First Partition of Poland: Frederick the Great and Catherine the Great each took a slice; and Maria Theresa, conscience-stricken by the act but resolved that Austria must have compensation for the gains of Prussia and Russia, also took a slice. In 1793, Russia and Prussia effected the Second Partition of Poland. In 1795, the Third, and final, Partition was arranged among the autocrats of Austria, Prussia, and Russia. Poland thus finally fell a victim to autocracy.

[1] The territorial gains of Louis XIV are indicated on pp. 828–831. Louis XV obtained Lorraine in 1766 and Corsica in 1768.

On such gains, autocracy survived in Russia, Prussia, and Austria after the French Revolution and far into Modern Times.

(3) *The Rise of the United States of America.* — The Seven Years' War led to quarrels between England and her American colonies. The defeat of the French in America gave the English colonists a feeling of greater strength and security, and made them less timid about opposing their mother-country. Moreover, the English government after the Seven Years' War attempted to enforce the mercantilist regulation of colonial trade more strictly than before, much to the displeasure of the colonists. The result was the American Revolution of 1776 and the establishment of the United States as an independent nation.

The Thirteen American Colonies in 1760. — When George III became King of England in 1760, there were thirteen important English colonies extending along the Atlantic coast of North America from New Hampshire and Massachusetts, on the north, to Georgia, on the south.[1] Each was growing rapidly in population and each cherished political institutions which it had derived from the mother-country: the English "common law," an Assembly (a kind of Parliament), etc.

Circumstances favored the development of a more radical spirit of liberty and democracy in America than in England. (1) A large number of English colonists had come to America in order to escape persecution or oppression. Puritans came to New England because they were persecuted by the Stuart Kings in England. Catholics sought freedom of worship in Maryland, Baptists in Rhode Island, and Quakers in Pennsylvania. Colonists of this sort, who had travelled three thousand miles to escape oppression, were not the kind of men to submit easily to renewed oppression.

(2) There was no hereditary aristocracy in the colonies. White men were not divided so sharply as in England into superior and inferior social classes. There was a much greater spirit of equality.

[1] The thirteen, with their dates of establishment, were as follows: Virginia (1607), Massachusetts (1620), Maryland (1634), Rhode Island (1636), Connecticut (1639), North Carolina (1653), New York (1664), New Jersey (1664), Delaware (1664), South Carolina (1671), New Hampshire (1679), Pennsylvania (1681), and Georgia (1733).

As William Penn, the founder of Pennsylvania, once complained, the colonists seemed to "think nothing taller than themselves but the trees."

(3) The English Kings for a long time permitted a large amount of self-government in the colonies. The colonies were so far away, and communication across the Atlantic was so difficult in the days of sailing vessels, that it was not easy to exercise very effective control from England. Moreover, since the colonies on the North American coast were at first considered rather poor and unprofitable, it hardly seemed worth while to interfere with their local affairs. Later, when England awoke to the fact that these colonies were becoming important, an attempt was made to bring them under more thorough control, but it was then too late, for the colonists had become too strong and too independent to submit tamely. England's attempt to interfere with the rights of self-government which the colonists had learned to cherish simply drove the colonists to assert their complete independence.

Friction between England and the Colonies. — Before the time of George III the taxes and restrictions which England imposed on colonial trade aroused little opposition because, being poorly enforced, they did not bear heavily on the colonists. But the taxes imposed during the early years of George III's reign were of such a nature as to anger the most influential classes of people in the North American colonies. For example, the Sugar Act of 1764 aroused the opposition of colonial merchants, and the Stamp Act of 1765 angered the lawyers and journalists. These acts nearly caused a rebellion. James Otis, a lawyer, declared that the English Parliament had no right to tax the colonists, because they were not represented in it: "Taxation without representation," he said "is tyranny." Patrick Henry, another lawyer, boldly warned George III to remember the fate of King Charles I. Benjamin Franklin asserted that the colonists would never submit to the stamp tax "unless compelled by force of arms."

The English Parliament repealed the Stamp Tax (1766) in time to avert bloodshed, but at the same time it passed a Declaratory Act, affirming in theory that England had supreme authority over the colonies.

Obstinately refusing to heed the signs of danger, George III and his ministers persisted in their attempts to tax the colonies. Only a year after the repeal of the Stamp Act, Parliament levied taxes on glass, lead, paper, tea, and various other articles imported into the colonies. Worse still, it enacted that colonists violating its laws should be tried without juries, and that the new taxes should be used to maintain an English army in the colonies.

King George III

By this time, so much hostility and suspicion had been awakened in the colonies that any tax imposed by England, no matter how small, was sure to be opposed. It was useless for the English Parliament to repeal all the taxes except that on tea. Even the tax on tea was hated and resisted. Instead of yielding to colonial opposition, George III and his ministers adopted harsh measures, such as sending troops to overawe the colonists, depriving Massachusetts of her rights of self-government, and closing the harbor of Boston to trade. Under these circumstances, revolution became inevitable.

The American Revolution. — In 1774 representatives from the various colonies formed a joint congress (the "Continental Congress," they called it) in order to present a united front against English aggression. In 1775 fighting occurred between colonists and English soldiers at Lexington and Concord. Thereupon the Continental Congress declared open war against England, appointed George Washington commander-in-chief of the American army, sent agents to France and other European countries to request foreign aid, and addressed a final petition to George III. But the English King would listen to no suggestion of compromise.

Declaration of Independence (1776). — On July 4, 1776, the thirteen colonies declared themselves "free and independent," and the United States of America thereby came into existence. The Declaration of Independence, written for the most part by Thomas Jefferson, proclaimed three important principles, all contrary to the doctrine of autocracy or "divine-right" monarchy. (1) All men — not merely Englishmen — are endowed by their Creator with certain "inalienable" rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. (2) Governments "derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." This is the basic principle of political democracy. (3) Hence it is perfectly justifiable to overthrow one government and establish a new one, by force of arms if necessary. This is the "right of revolution" — a right which had occasionally been used in the Middle Age and which many nations were to use, in later Modern Times, as the method of establishing democracy.



George Washington

The War of American Independence. — At first, the fighting favored the English. But in 1777 the Americans won a notable victory in the battle of Saratoga, and this gave King Louis XVI of France the hope that by helping the Americans he could recover some of the colonies which France had lost in earlier wars with England. So France allied herself with the United States and in 1778 declared war against England. Spain and Holland soon

joined France, and the War of American Independence became almost world-wide.

The Treaty of Paris (1783). — Peace was concluded at Paris in 1783. England recognized the independence of the United States. France regained, however, only two insignificant colonies, and Spain recovered Minorca and Florida.

The Constitution of the United States (1787). — Shortly after the conclusion of peace, the new American nation adopted a Constitution which provided for a union of the States under a republican form of federal government. Each state retained control of many of its local affairs, but the federal government of President, Congress, and Supreme Court was to exercise supreme authority in numerous matters. George Washington, the noble "father of his country," became first President of the United States in 1789.

Significance of the American Revolution. — The establishment of an independent Republic in America was a great event in the history of the world.

(1) The American Revolution of the eighteenth century went much farther than the English Revolutions of the seventeenth century. It struck a blow not only at autocracy but at aristocracy also. The idea of the "right of revolution," the right of a people to overthrow an oppressive government, whether autocratic or aristocratic, was greatly strengthened by the American example.

(2) The United States was the first great federal republic to be established over a large area. It showed the possibility, in Modern Times, of employing democracy in a big country instead of limiting its use, as the ancient Greeks had done, to small city-states.

(3) The American Revolution was one of the causes of the great French Revolution which broke out in 1789 and destroyed autocracy in France.

(4) The American Revolution was likewise one of the causes which subsequently spurred Spanish colonists in America to resent mercantilist regulation of their commerce, to revolt against their mother-country, and to establish independent republics in South America, Central America, and Mexico.

Summary. — Autocracy was in decline in the eighteenth century. It is true that at the time it did not seem to be in decline

on the Continent of Europe. "Enlightened" autocrats or despots were trying to promote the welfare of their subjects. But even "enlightened" despotism possessed fatal weaknesses.

FREDERICK THE GREAT

Weaknesses of Enlightened Despotism. — (1) One marked weakness was the unwillingness of the despots to devote all their energy to internal reform; all of them were ambitious to enlarge their territories, and the consequent wars and conquests played havoc with their other efforts. No period witnessed international conflicts of a more selfish and immoral sort than those of the period of "enlightened" despotism. It was autocracy which inspired such bloody wars as resulted from the seizure of Silesia by Frederick the Great and such shameful transactions as resulted in the partition of Poland. And in a few years of peace not even "enlightened" despots could make good all the losses of the many years of war.

(2) Another grave weakness of "enlightened" despotism was the contemptuous attitude of the "enlightened" despot toward his "unenlightened" subjects. He believed that he knew what was for the good of his people better than they knew themselves, and accordingly he forced reforms on them whether the reforms were popularly desired or not. In other words, "enlightened" despotism was government for the people, but not by the people.

(3) A final weakness of "enlightened" despotism lay in the fact that its continuation depended upon every able sovereign's being succeeded by a sovereign equally able. This seldom happened. When Louis XIV, the Grand Monarch, died in 1715, he was succeeded, as King of France, by the lazy and vicious Louis XV.

When Frederick the Great died in 1786, he was succeeded on the Prussian throne by a nephew who had neither ability nor character. The same thing happened in other countries.

The Revolutions. — It was natural, under the circumstances, that people should revolt against autocrats and get rid of despotism. The English "limited" their monarchy by two revolutions in the seventeenth century. English colonists in America put an end to oppressive trade-regulation and started a new era in democratic self-government by their revolution in the eighteenth century. Simultaneously there began in England an Industrial Revolution, which gave us the modern steam-engine, the modern factory, and the modern steamboat and railway. This Industrial Revolution was to be, in Modern Times, the final foe to autocracy and the greatest aid to the spread of democracy.

In the year 1789 — about the time of the invention of the new steam-engine and only three years after the death of Frederick the Great and the very year in which George Washington became first President of the United States — a great political and social revolution commenced in France. The French Revolution destroyed autocracy not only in France but throughout Western Europe. In the long run it shook autocracy even in Eastern Europe. But the story of the French Revolution belongs clearly to Modern History.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. What were the Great Powers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries?
2. What was autocracy? What was "enlightened" despotism and what were its weaknesses?
3. How, in England, was religious opposition to autocracy combined with political and economic opposition?
4. How and why did the Puritan Revolution fail? Did it have any permanent results?
5. Discuss the English Revolution of 1688, with special reference to its immediate causes and results.
6. In what ways was the triumph of the English Parliament finally assured? What was the Bill of Rights? The Toleration Act? The Act of Settlement? The Act of Union? The Party System? The Cabinet System?

7. Who were the Bourbon Kings of France? Who were the Habsburgs? The Hohenzollerns? The Romanovs?

8. Why was Louis XIV called the "Grand Monarch," and why is it said that autocracy reached its climax in his reign?

9. Who was Colbert? Discuss his policies and achievements.

10. What aims did Louis XIV try to carry out in his foreign policy? What wars did he wage? What did he gain? Did he lose anything?

11. What measures did Peter the Great take to establish autocracy in Russia?

12. What "windows" for Russia did Peter seek? At whose expense? Look up a present-day map of Russia and see whether Peter's "windows" are still open.

13. What do you think you would have done if you had been born in Peter's place?

14. Who did more for Prussia — the Great Elector or Frederick the Great? Would we regard Frederick as a great hero if he were alive now and attempted to carry out the same sort of policies to-day that he carried out in the eighteenth century?

15. In what ways did Frederick the Great show himself to be an "enlightened" despot?

16. Why were colonies valued in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries?

17. Make a list of the chief wars waged in Europe from 1689 to 1783, and discuss both the dynastic and the colonial aspects of each.

18. Discuss the effects of the Seven Years' War on England. On France. On the English colonies in America.

19. Explain how friction developed between England and her American colonies.

20. Why was the American Revolution of world-wide importance?

21. Compare democracy of the old Greek or Roman city-state with democracy of the modern United States.

SPECIAL TOPICS

The Dutch revolution. HAYES, *Modern Europe*, I, 91–97.

Puritanism. GREEN, *Short History of the English People*, ch. viii, section 1; GARDINER, *First Two Stuarts and the Puritan Revolution*, 1–6, 13–17.

Trial and execution of Charles I. FIRTH, *Oliver Cromwell*, 215–231.

Cromwell. CHEYNEY, *Short History of England*, 444–464; BEARD, *English Historians*, 381–390; FIRTH, *Oliver Cromwell*, ch. xx.

Richelieu. ADAMS, *Growth of the French Nation*, 192–201; PERKINS, *Richelieu*, chs. vi, xii; HAYES, *Modern Europe*, I, 212–216.

France at the close of the reign of Louis XIV. PERKINS, *France under the Regency*, ch. ix.

Court life at Versailles. HASSALL, *Louis XIV*, ch. xi; PERKINS, *France under the Regency*, ch. v.

Russia before Peter the Great. HAYES, *Modern Europe*, I, 21–22, 366–369; SCHUYLER, *Peter the Great*, I, 1–8.

Peter's reforms. JOHNSON, *Age of the Enlightened Despot*, 99–105; ROBINSON and BEARD, *Readings*, I, 61–63; RAMBAUD, *History of Russia*, II, ch. iii.

Catherine the Great. RAMBAUD, *History of Russia*, II, ch. x.

The Great Elector. HENDERSON, *Short History of Germany*, II, 9–29; WAKEMAN, *Ascendancy of France*, 176–184, 292–297.

Youth of Frederick the Great. HENDERSON, *Short History of Germany*, II, 111–122; REDDAWAY, *Frederick the Great*, 24–55.

William Pitt. MACAULAY, *Essay on William Pitt, the Earl of Chatham;* FREDERIC HARRISON, *Chatham*, 75–118.

Clive. MACAULAY, *Essay on Lord Clive.*

The French in America. BOLTON and MARSHALL, *Colonization of North America*, ch. iv; ROBINSON and BEARD, *Readings*, I, 114–121.

Life in the American colonies before the Revolution. BEARD, *History of the United States*, chs. ii–iii; BECKER, *Beginnings of the American People*, ch. v.

The American Declaration of Independence. FISKE, *American Revolution*, I, 172–197.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THE TEACHER

C. J. H. HAYES, *Modern Europe*, I. S. R. GARDINER, *The First Two Stuarts and the Puritan Revolution.* C. H. FIRTH, *Cromwell.* R. LODGE, *Political History of England, 1660–1702.* W. E. LECKY, *History of England in the Eighteenth Century.* H. O. WAKEMAN, *Ascendancy of France, 1598–1715.* A. H. JOHNSON, *Age of the Enlightened Despot, 1660–1789.* A. HASSALL, *Louis XIV.* A. RAMBAUD, *History of Russia*, I, II. R. N. BAIN, *Charles XII.* E. F. HENDERSON, *A Short History of Germany*, II. W. F. REDDAWAY, *Frederick the Great.* J. FISKE, *New France and New England.* J. FISKE, *American Revolution.* F. PARKMAN, *The Struggle for a Continent.* A. HASSALL, *Balance of Power, 1715–1789.* G. O. TREVELYAN, *The American Revolution.*

CONVENIENT SOURCE MATERIALS

J. H. ROBINSON and C. A. BEARD, *Readings in Modern History*, I. E. P. CHEYNEY, *Readings in English History.* S. R. GARDINER, *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1628–1660.* C. G. ROBERTSON, *Select Statutes, Cases, and Documents, 1660–1832. Letters of Mme. de Sévigné*, selections trans. by C. SYMS.

EPILOGUE

PASSING TO MODERN CIVILIZATION

Human Progress. — We have now learned something of a very long and complicated story — the story of human progress.

The Mysterious "Stone Age." — The first part of human history — the so-called "Stone Age" — lasted longer than all the later "Ages" combined, and yet we have learned least about it. Only one of our twenty-four chapters has dealt with it. That is because comparatively little is known about it.

We do know that during the numberless centuries of the Stone Age men changed their ways of living and working, that they spread out over Asia, Africa, Europe, America, and the islands of the sea, and that they established great civilizations in Egypt, Mesopotamia, China, India, Mexico, and Peru.

The Earliest Recorded Civilizations. — The story of human progress since Pharaohs reigned in Egypt and Sargon ruled in Babylon is surer and more detailed than the earlier story. Its actors have left us numerous written records. That is why we know more about it. And, generally speaking, the records become more and more numerous, the farther we proceed on our journey from the Egypt or the Mesopotamia of seven thousand years ago to the America or the Europe of the present day. Let us here recall a few of the principal landmarks in this journey.

At the start, significant civilization was restricted to peoples living at or near the eastern end of the Mediterranean Sea — along the Nile River in Egypt, along the Tigris and Euphrates valleys in Babylonia and Assyria, and on the island of Crete. Among these peoples considerable commerce developed, and gradually other peoples rose to prominence in the Near East — the Hittites, the Semites of Syria (Phœnicians and Hebrews), the Greeks, and the Persians. Gradually, too, more distant peoples evolved sep-

arate civilizations — the Chinese in the Far East and the Aryan invaders in India (and, later, the Mayas in America).

The Classical Civilizations. — Then arose, some twenty-five hundred years ago, a more unified civilization, the civilization which we call "classical." It developed among the Greeks and was diffused by them throughout the Near East and even into India. Soon it was appropriated by the hardy inhabitants of an Italian town on the Tiber River, and, as the city-state of Rome expanded into the Roman Empire, classical civilization became the common property of all peoples in southern Europe, western Asia, and northern Africa, in the entire circle of lands surrounding the Mediterranean Sea. Almost simultaneously, a type of classical civilization flourished in China, and another in India. But still the greater part of the Earth's surface was outside of classical civilization and quite barbarous.

The Missionary Religions. — Next appeared three great missionary religions: (1) Buddhism; (2) Christianity; and (3) Islam. All assailed tribalism; all preached human brotherhood; all served to extend the frontiers of civilization.

Buddhism, originating in India, became very influential in China, and by its spread to Korea, Japan, and Indo-China, brought these lands into the cultural area of the Far East.

Christianity, beginning among Hebrews in Palestine, supplanted Paganism in the larger part of the Roman Empire, and, by its missionary efforts, converted barbarians, and created a compact cultural area of the West, which embraced almost all of Europe and fragments of Western Asia.

Islam, arising among the Arabs on the Red Sea, swept over northern Africa, and western and central Asia, and penetrated into India and the East Indies, transforming classical and pagan civilizations in these lands and making the Near East and Middle East together an area of Moslem culture.

Christian Civilization in Europe. — On Europe we centered our attention. First, we noted how, in the "Roman Christian Era," from 300 to 500 A.D., Christianity became the state religion of the Roman Empire and how the Christians began to convert and civilize invading barbarians in southern Europe. Secondly,

we noted how, in the "Dark Age," from 500 to 1000 A.D., almost all of Europe was partially barbarized by the invaders, but gradually Christianized. Thirdly, we noted how, in the "Middle Age," from 1000 to 1400 A.D., Europe was lifted up, unified, and marked by a progressive Christian civilization which expressed itself in society, government, and art.

The Transition to Modern Civilization, 1400–1750 A.D. — Then came to Europe, between 1400 and 1750 A.D., an "Era of Transition." Europe was brought into contact with other times and with other places. By means of the "classical revival" it made contact with the culture of the ancient Greeks and Romans. It made contact, also, with the Near East and Middle East, in the protracted Crusades, and with the Far East and with America, in novel voyages of exploration and discovery, in increasing commercial intercourse, in extended missionary endeavor, and in distant colonization. Every such contact — and all such contacts taken together — had enormous effects on Europe and on the whole world. These effects commenced to appear in the "Era of Transition," and they have profoundly influenced the course of human progress since 1750 A.D. and the nature of Modern Civilization.

Preparation for Modern History. — At this point—about 1789 A.D.—we have paused in our story. It is to be hoped that we have learned enough of Ancient and Medieval History to prepare us for a proper understanding of Modern History.

Modern History is a term that is sometimes employed to cover the last two, three, four, or even five centuries. Such divisions of history are neither rigid nor sacred. They are largely matters of convenience. From our present point of view, we prefer to regard Modern History as the record of the period from about 1789 A.D. to the present — only about 140 years in all.

Yet Modern History is so close to our own day, so full of persons and events of immediate importance to us, so interesting in itself, that its story can best be reserved for telling in another book. Let us, then, close the present book with an idea that we have covered a large part of human history in preparation for its latest stage.

More particularly, let us close the present book with the knowledge that the "Era of Transition," from 1400 to 1750 A.D., was

neither wholly medieval nor wholly modern. It was both. It marked the end of much that was essentially medieval or ancient and the beginning of much that we think of as being distinctively modern and of our own day.

Elements of Modern Civilization. — (1) *Its Universal Scope.* — For example, civilization is now almost universal and relatively uniform throughout the world. There is no sharp contrast between one small but highly civilized region, on the one hand, and vast surrounding districts of barbarism, on the other. There are no "separated" civilizations. There are differences, it is true, between one country and another, between one Continent and another, between the "West" and the "Far East." But the "West" now includes North and South America and Australia and a large part of Africa, as well as Europe, and certain outstanding features of its civilization are now stamped upon the rest of the world. Western civilization, moreover, is no longer what it was in the Middle Age. Its contacts with other times and other places have modified it and enriched it and transformed it into the universal material civilization of the whole modern world. Such a transformation was fostered by: (1) the Crusades, (2) overseas expansion, (3) the break in the Christian Church.

(2) *Its Civil, rather than Religious, Character.* — Again, religion is not so obviously important in modern times as in past ages. Each ancient empire was dominated by priests quite as much as by kings, and the life and the thought of Christendom were directed during the Middle Age by the Christian Church. Now the Christian Church is broken, much of the work once done by priests is performed by civil governments, and, though Christianity and Judaism and Buddhism and Islam are still very important in the lives of millions of individual human beings, they occupy no commanding position in public life. It is now deemed desirable that every country should tolerate all religions, and that Catholic Christians and Protestant Christians should vie with one another, and likewise with Buddhists and Moslems and Jews, not as warriors, but only in peace and good works. This great change was begun during the "Age of Transition" by (1) the rise of strong civil states under autocratic lay rulers, (2) the outcome of distant

explorations and discoveries, (3) the classical revival, (4) the break in the Church, and (5) the advance of knowledge.

(3) *Its Material Aspect.* — Again, a very large part of mankind no longer inhabit the countryside and earn their living by tilling the soil, as the vast mass of human beings did in ancient and medieval times. They now reside in cities and work in factories, mines, shops, offices, or banks. To countless centuries which were mainly agricultural has succeeded our modern century which is chiefly industrial and commercial. Wealth in land and cattle has been followed by wealth in stocks and bonds. The modern age is an age of capitalism. And modern capitalism is an outcome of developments during the "Age of Transition": (1) the Crusades, (2) the rise of autocracy, and (3) overseas expansion.

(4) *Its Stress on Equality, Democracy, and Nationalism.* — Nowadays we stress individual rights, social equality, democracy, and nationalism. These things do not come directly from the "Age of Transition." They are typically modern and spring immediately from the English Revolutions of the seventeenth century, from the American and French Revolutions of the eighteenth century, and from the Industrial Revolution of the nineteenth century. In fact, they represent the reaction against a tendency which set in during the "Age of Transition" and survived into Modern Times, a tendency to promote autocracy, to exalt divine-right or absolute monarchy, to heighten social inequality, and to confuse the common interests of a nation with the family interests of its despot. Against this tendency, they represent a reaction, but the reaction is not exclusively modern. It goes back, at least in part and indirectly, to the earlier teaching of human brotherhood by great world-religions and especially to the medieval practice of Christian Europeans.

(5) *Its Printed Records.* — Another peculiarity distinguishes modern times. We can know vastly more about the last three hundred years, particularly the last century and a half, than about all the preceding thousands of years. This is because printing was invented in the "Age of Transition." This is also the chief reason why we leave the latest chapter of the story of human progress to another book and call it "Modern History."

INDEX

Abbas, 515
Abbasid, caliphs and family, 515–516, 517–518, 645, 646, 653, 668–669
Abd-ar-Rahman III, 519–520
Abelard, 618–619, 622–623
Abu Bekr, 476
Academy, 186, 197, 220
Acadia, 744, 848
Achæa (Achæans), 127–133, 136, 147, 200
Achæan League, 290, 291
Achilles, 131, 224, 225
Acragas, 180
Acre, 654, 661
Acropolis, 149, 154, 178, 181, 186, 193
Adalbert, 507
Adelard of Bath, 633
Adrianople, 445, 657, 665
Ædiles, 254, 257
Ægean civilization, 76. *See also "Crete," "Minoan Age and Culture," "Mycenæan Age"*
Ægean Islands, 657, 659, 665, 670. *See also "Chios," "Lesbos," etc.*
Ægina, 139, 147, 150, 200
Æolian cities, 134
Æqui and Volsci, 262
Æschylus, 192
Ætolian League, 286, 288, 289 note
Africa, 20, 270, 724–726, 744–745. *See also "Algeria," "Cape of Good Hope," "Carthage," "Cyrene," "Egypt," "Ethiopia," "Libya," "Nubia," "Numidia," "Morocco," "Negroes," "Tripoli," "Tunis"*
Africa, Roman province of, 283, 295, 300, 306, 324; Vandals in, 446–447, 448, 452, 465
Agade, 56
Agamemnon, 128, 131
Agincourt, battle of, 698
Agra, 734
Agri Decumates, 353
Agriculture, beginnings of, 21–22; in ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia, 49–50, 69; in ancient America, 110–111; Hellenistic, 233; Carthaginian, 271; Roman, 245, 284–285, 303–304, 306, 365; in "dark age," 441, 458, 464, 514; medieval, frontispiece, 524–527, 528–529, 533–540; Prussian, 844
Ahriman, 93
Ahura Mazda, 93, 163, 167, 355. *See also "Mazda"*
Aids, Feudal, 527
Ainus, 103
Aix-la-Chapelle, 491; treaty of (1668), 830; treaty of (1748), 849
Akbar, 733–734
Akkad, 52, 56, 57
Alans, 444, 446, 452, 457
Alaric, 445–446, 447
Albanians, 671
Albigenses, 570, 593 note, 599, 614, 687, 784
Alcazar, 518
Alchemy, 631–632
Alcibiades, 201
Alcuin, 492, 519
Aldus Manutius, 780
Alemans, 444, 447, 466, 487
Aleppo, 661
Alexander, the Great, of Macedon, 223–229, 235, 236, 384–385, 460, 658, 715
Alexander III, Pope, 576
Alexander VI, Pope, 748, 786
Alexandria, 226, 230, 231, 234–235, 236, 237, 330, 425, 432, 434, 461
Alexius I, Emperor, 647, 649, 650, 651
Alexius III, Emperor, 656, 659
Alfred the Great, 511, 512
Algebra, 519, 634, 679
Algeria, 477, 645, 669
Alhambra, 520
Ali, Caliph, 476, 516
Aliens, in Athens, 199
Allies, Latin, 262, 265, 310, 319; Italian, 264–265, 277, 278, 310, 312; 275, 276, 277, 291–292, 298

Allodial farmers, 528–529
Alphabet, 82–83, 104, 140, 247, 250, 384, 442
Alphonso VIII, of Castile, 673
Alphonso X, of Castile, 603, 612
Alphonso III, of Portugal, 603
Alps, Hannibal crosses, 277–278
Alsace, 803, 828, 830, 831, 832
Altamira, cave, 15
Ambrose, 433, 437, 623
Amenemhet III, 48
Amenhotep IV, 67
America, early, 109–119, 120, 715, 741; European discovery of, 513, 726–730. *See also "Brazil," "Canada," "Indians, American," "Mexico," "Peru," "United States," "West Indies"*
American Revolution, 856–859, 867
Amiens, 638
Amon, 63, 65, 67, 68, 71, 226
Amphictyonic League, 147
Anabaptists, 797
Anabasis, 209 note
Anacreon, 156
Anagni, 600
Anatomy, 236
Ancestor worship, 120
Angelico, Fra, 623
Angles, 444, 447, 450–451, 454, 466, 468–470
Anglicanism (Anglicans), 792–794, 795, 801, 804, 812, 817–818
Animals, domestication of, 23
Anjou, 557, 596, 598, 604, 698
Annam, 400
Annates, 688
Anne, of England, 818, 820, 848
Ansgar, 513
Antalcidas, Peace of, 209
Antigonid dynasty, 285
Antigonus, 285
Antioch, 230, 231, 288, 416, 425, 434, 461, 646, 651, 652, 654, 661
Antiochus, 288–289
Antisthenes, 238
Antonines. *See "Antoninus," "Marcus Aurelius," "Commodus"*
Antoninus, 343
Antony, Mark, 322, 323, 324, 325
Antwerp, 711
Aphrodite, 130; of Melos, 231, 236
Apollo, 148, 182; Belvedere, 231
Apollonia, 148
Appian Way, 267
Apprentices, 547–549
Aquitaine (Aquitanians), 298, 488, 494, 596, 598
Arab Empire, 476–483, 514, 515–518, 645
Arabia (Arabs), 79, 354 note, 402, 452, 461, 470–483, 496, 505, 516, 610, 676, 679
Aragon, 602, 603, 604, 673, 711
Aramaic language, 163, 355, 371
Arbela, 226
Arch, 72, 124, 368
Archimedes, 237, 280 note
Architecture. *See "Art"*
Archons, 150, 152, 159, 188
Areopagus, 150, 152
Argos, 133, 146–147, 148, 209
Arianism (Arians), 431–432, 464–466, 470
Ariosto, 762
Ariovistus, 298
Aristagoras, 171–172, 173
Aristarchus, 235
Aristides, 176, 185–186
Aristophanes, 193
Aristotle, 220–222, 224, 236, 492, 519, 610, 625–626, 629, 633, 679, 753
Arithmetic, 72, 616–617, 634
Armada, 802
Armenia (Armenians), 84, 86, 87, 92, 165, 168, 324, 346, 354, 355, 431, 452, 461, 477, 481, 646, 650, 653, 661, 665, 670
Arminius, 351
Army, Egyptian, 62–63, 71; Assyrian, 85; Spartan, 144–145; Athenian, 159, 175; Persian, 164, 171, 175; Macedonian, 222–223; Roman, 251, 259–260, 278, 301, 307, 328, 443; Barbarian, 441; Italian, 586–587; French, 705, 826–827; Russian, 837; Prussian, 842
Arras, treaty of, 700
Arsacid dynasty, 354, 460
Art, Palæolithic, 15; Egyptian, 63–65; Cretan, 75; Assyrian, 86, 88; Mayan, 112–113; Peruvian, 118; Greek, 124, 137; Athenian, 193–195; Hellenistic, 212–213, 230; Roman, 367–370; Chinese, 400,401; early Christian, 435–438, 504; in "dark age," 450, 486, 492; Moslem, 482–483, 516, 518–520; Byzantine, 499–502; medieval, 548, 550, 635–641; classical revival of,

760–772; French, 823–824. *See also "Music" and "Painting"*
Artois, 557, 830, 831
Aryan languages, 162 note, 611
Aryans, 105–109
Ashtoreth, 81
Ashur, 85, 87
Ashurbanipal, 89
Asia, Roman province of, 292, 294, 295, 300, 310, 319
Asoka, 386–387
Assembly, Spartan, 144; Athenian, 152, 159, 176, 187, 188, 189, 190; Roman, 253, 254, 255–256, 257, 258, 273, 284, 287, 308, 310, 319, 327, 334
Assyria, 58, 85–90, 92, 164
Astrology, 631–632, 775
Astronomy, 96, 124, 372, 616, 617, 631, 737
Athena, 129–130, 148, 154, 181, 186
Athens, employs Ionian artists, 137; issues coins, 139; wars with Persia, 172–179; establishes empire, 181–185; under Pericles, 186–202; a type, 205; regains power, 209; fights Thebes, 210; oratory at, 215; philosophy, 218–222; defeated by Macedonia, 223; decline, 230; in third century B.C., 286, 292, 293; students, 330; beautified by Hadrian, 343; Christianity preached at, 416; sacked by Goths, 445
Attica, 149. *See also "Athens"*
Attila, 457–458, 513, 661
Augsburg, religious peace of, 792, 802
Augustine, of Canterbury, 467, 468
Augustine, of Hippo, 437, 492, 622
Augustus, 326–331, 334, 336, 350–351, 359, 410; title, 326, 334, 346, 398. *See also "Octavian"*
Aurangzeb, 734, 851
Aurelian, 346
Australia, 806
Austrasia, 487, 488
Austria, 444, 557, 571, 578, 579, 670, 675–676, 708, 710–711, 800, 806, 828, 830, 831, 834, 841, 847–850, 852, 853–854.
Austrian Succession, War of, 849
Autocracy, 404–405, 498, 670–671, 679, 682–686, 694, 702, 703–712, 787, 811–860
Averroës, 625–626
Avesta, 93
Avignon, 600, 689–691
Axe, invention of, 24–25
Azores Islands, 725, 748
Aztecs, 115–117, 120, 741–742

Baal, 81
Baal-Moloch, 272, 277
Baber, 733
Babylon (Babylonia), 56, 57, 85, 87, 88, 89–91, 92, 104, 165, 166, 168, 227. *See also "Mesopotamia"*
Babylonian Captivity, 91, 689–691, 785
Bacon, Francis, 763, 773
Bacon, Roger, 633, 634, 773
Baffin, 730
Bagdad, Caliphate of, 515–516, 519, 626, 645, 646, 653, 661, 664, 668–669
Balboa, 730
Baldwin, Emperor, 658
Bannockburn, battle of, 596, 602
Baptism, Christian, 624 note
Baptists, 797, 801, 804, 817 note, 854
Barbarians, 181, 440
Barter, 48, 70, 138
Basel, Council of, 694
Basil, 462
Basil II, Emperor, 507
Basileus, 498
Batavia, 740
Bavaria (Bavarians), 491, 506, 514, 557, 579, 800, 806
Bedouin Arabs. *See "Arabia"*
Belgium (Belgians), 298, 711, 800, 806, 828, 830, 831, 834
Belgrade, 669, 670
Belisarius, 452–454
Benedict, 462–464
Benedictines, 462–470, 486, 493, 560, 640
Benefice, 524
Berbers, 477, 515, 516, 645, 676
Bernard of Clairvaux, 609–610, 619, 652
Bethlehem, 411
Beyrout, 654
Bible, 30, 79, 82, 427–428, 437, 465, 629, 775, 780, 790, 793, 795, 799, 807
Biology, 235–236
Bishop, 426, 433, 469, 559; of Rome, *see "Pope"*
Bithynia, 292
Black Death, 696

Black Prince, 696
"Blues," 500
Boats, earliest, 24, 34, 37
Boccaccio, 614, 755, 756
Bœotia, 147, 177, 178, 200
Boghaz Keui, 84, 106
Bohemia, under Holy Roman Empire, 571, 573, 611, 711. *See also "Czechoslovakia"*
Boleslav, 507
Bologna, University of, 619, 620, 623, 627–628, 684
Boniface, 505–506
Boniface VIII, Pope, 600, 609, 689
Book of the Dead, 67
Bordeaux, 697
Boris, of Bulgaria, 509
Bosphorus, 168
Bourbon, 557; family, 796, 803, 821, 827–828, 831, 834, 844, 847, 848, 849
Bourgeois, 541 note, 552. *See also "Middle Class"*
Bouvines, battle of, 598
Bow and arrows, invention of, 16
Boyne, battle of, 818 note
Braddock, 850
Brahmanism (Brahmans), 108, 381. *See "Hinduism," "Religion, Hindu"*
Brandenburg, 557, 573, 579, 803, 840–841. *See also "Hohenzollern," "Prussia"*
Brazil, 729, 730, 743, 748, 800, 844
Bremen, 557, 581, 803
Breslau, 843
Brétigny, treaty of, 696, 698
Britain, mines in, 30; Celtic invasions of, 296; Roman conquest of, 298; Roman occupation of, 340, 345, 346, 429, 431; Roman wall in, 353–354; German conquest of, 447, 448, 450–451, 453, 459. *For later history, see "England"*
Brittany, 601, 619, 695, 706
Bronze, 29, 34, 83, 98, 133, 244; Age, 133, 244–245
Bruce, Robert, 596, 602
Bruges, 581, 585
Brusa, 665
Brutus, 322, 324
Budapest, 670
Buddhism. *See "Gautama Buddha," "Religion, Buddhist"*
Bulgaria (Bulgarians), 459, 496–497, 509, 661, 665, 666, 670, 672, 676; language, 611
Burgher, 541 note
Burgundians, 444, 447, 452, 465, 466
Burgundy, 487, 488, 557, 601, 694, 697, 700, 705, 709, 711
Burma, 386, 387, 661
Byblos, 81, 82
Byzantine Empire, 410, 495, 508, 646, 647, 651, 654–660, 665–668, 756
Byzantium, 348, 495. *See also "Byzantine Empire"*

Cabinet, English, 820, 834
Cabot, 722, 729, 730
Cabral, 729
Cadiz, 673
Cæsar, Julius, 297–299, 306 note, 315–322, 323, 334, 359, 441, 753, 758
Cæsar, title, 338, 346
Cæsarea, 437, 477
Cairo, Caliphate of, 517, 645, 647–648, 653, 664. *See also "Fatimid family"*
Calais, 696, 697, 701
Calderon, 762
Calendar, Egyptian, 38; Chinese, 100; Mayan, 114; Julian, 320; Germanic, 442; Moslem, 476; Gregorian, 777 note
Calicut, 722, 725
Caligula (Caius Cæsar), 334, 336, 338
Caliph, 476–477, 479, 483, 515–518, 645, 646, 653, 661. *See also "Abbasid," "Fatimid," "Omayyad," "Religion, Moslem"*
Calvin (Calvinism, Calvinist), 794–797, 798, 801–804, 812, 817
Cambrai, 542
Cambridge, University of, 619, 620
Cambyses, 167
Camel, 23
Camoëns, 762
Canada, 806, 845, 852
Canary Is., 270
Cannæ, 279
Cannon, 685
Canon Law. *See "Law, Canon"*
Canossa, 565, 575
Canterbury, 467–468, 591, 593
Canton, 726, 736, 737
Canute, 512
Cape of Good Hope, 725
Capetian Kings, 596–601

Capitalism, ancient, 304–306; medieval, 584, 717; early modern, 747, 787, 795–796, 867
Capitularies, 491
Capitulations, 672
Cappadocia, 292
Capua, 263, 279, 280, 284
Caracalla, 345, 346
Cardinals, College of, 564
Carloman, 490
Carlowitz, treaties of, 675–676
Carolina, 744
Carolingian family, 489, 494; Empire, 506, 511. *See also "Charlemagne," "Charles Martel," "Pepin"*
Carthage, 82, 180–181, 207–208, 247, 264, 270–283, 310, 319, 446–447, 452, 461
Cartier, 730
Casimir III, the Great, of Poland, 603
Cassiodorus, 617 note
Cassius, 322, 324
Caste, 108, 120
Castile, 602, 603–604, 673, 779
Castilian language and literature, 610, 611, 613, 614
Catacombs, 422
Catalan language and literature, 603, 604, 610, 614
Cateau-Cambrésis, treaty of, 712
Cathay. *See "China"*
Catherine of Siena, 691, 692
Catherine II, the Great, of Russia, 840, 843, 850, 853
Catholic, 425. *See "Church, Western (Catholic)"*
Catiline, 315
Cato, 282, 284, 289
Cattle, 23
Cavaliers, 813–814
Cave-men, 11
Celibacy, 563
Celtic language, 296, 440, 451, 611
Celts, 106, 296, 440, 441, 442, 450–451, 468–470, 493, 505, 602. *See also "Gauls," "Ireland," "Scotland," "Wales"*
Censors, 254, 257
Ceres, 252
Cervantes, 762
Ceylon, 383, 386, 387, 401, 726, 731
Chæronea, 223
Chalcidice, 140
Chalcis, 139, 140, 151
Châlons, battle of, 457–458
Champollion, 41 note
Chancellor, 730
Chandragupta Maurya, 385
Chang Ch'ien, 397
Charity, 435, 554, 561
Charlemagne, 489–494, 506, 516, 519
Charles V, Emperor, 710–712, 758, 775, 790, 791 note
Charles I, of England, 804, 811–814, 817, 855
Charles II, of England, 817, 819, 820
Charles VI, of France, 697, 698
Charles VII, of France, 698, 699, 700, 704–705, 709
Charles VIII, of France, 711–712
Charles XII, of Sweden, 839
Charles Martel, 478, 488, 489, 505, 699
Charles the Bald, 494
Charters, Town, 541–543
Chartres, 638
Chatham, Earl of, 850
Chaucer, 615
Chemistry, 617, 631–632
Cheops, 43–45
Ch'i, 393
Chichen Itza, 110, 114
Ch'in, 393
Chin, 393
China (Chinese), our debt to, 97; early, 98–103, 120, 715; in time of Confucius, 389–395; in contact with India and Near East, 395–403; Mongols in, 660–663, 720–723; Buddhism in, 715–716; under Ming dynasty, 723, 726, 735–737; under Manchu dynasty, 737–738, 740, 749; printing in, 777; language, 455
Chios, 134
Chivalry, 532
Cholula, 114
Chosroës II, 461
Chóu dynasty, 100–102, 120, 393
Christendom, 483
Christianity. *See "Church," "Jesus," "Pope," "Religion, Christian"*
Chrysoloras, 756
Ch'u, 393
Church, 415, 425–429, 432–434, 462, 467–468, 487, 492–493, 498
Church, Eastern (Orthodox), 502–505, 507–509, 647, 656, 658, 659, 663, 666, 678, 783, 806–808, 836, 837
Church, Western (Catholic), 502–505,

Church (*continued*):
505–509, 513, 514, 608; and feudalism, 528, 530; and private war, 530–532; and chivalry, 532; and social life in Middle Age, 539–540, 552–554; in Middle Age, 559–571; and national states, 588, 590–591, 593, 599–600; and education, 616–622; and art, 635–641; and crusades, 647, 648–659, 666, 678, 686–687; later medieval, 683, 686–694, 706, 708; missions of, 718–720, 721, 723, 726, 733, 736–739, 740, 743, 800; and humanism, 756–757, 759; opposition to, 783–787; reform of, 798–800; later history of, 800–808, 817
Churches, Protestant, 783, 788–798, 800–808, 812, 814, 817
Cicero, 305–306, 307, 315, 323, 324, 419, 753, 756, 758
Cid, 613
Cilicia, 87, 289, 295, 300, 329, 415
Cimbri, 297
Cimon, 186
City States, Egyptian, 41; Sumerian, 55; Phœnician, 81–82; Greek, 148, 205–207, 222; medieval European, 528, 540–551, 573–574, 576, 579, 580–587, 659–660, 679; decline of, 748
Clarendon, constitutions of, 590–591; assize of, 591
Classics (Classical), definition of, 121; revival of, 752–760, 763–766, 771–772, 774
Claudius, 334, 338, 425
Cleisthenes, 157–159
Clement VII, Pope, 691, 693
Cleopatra, 231, 321–322, 324, 325
Clergy, 425–426, 432, 590–591, 618, 621; regular, 560; secular, 559–560
Clermont, Council of, 649
Clients, 252
Clive, 851, 852
Clontarf, battle of, 512
Clovis, 466, 487
Cluny, and Cluniac Benedictines, 560, 563–564, 618, 648
Coatlicue, 116
Code. *See "Law"*
Coinage. *See "Money"*
Colbert, 824–826, 833, 845, 846
Collegia, 307, 366
Cologne, 557, 573, 581, 638
Coloni, 364
Colonies, Cretan, 75–76; Phœnician, 82, 180–181, 247, 270; Greek, 134–136, 139–142, 179–181, 200–202, 207–208, 247–248, 263–264; Roman, 265, 319–320; Portuguese, 729, 731, 733, 736, 743–744, 749, 844; Spanish, 706, 728, 740, 741–744, 749, 835, 844, 846–847, 848, 852, 858–859; Dutch, 739–740, 744, 745, 749, 835, 844; French, 730, 744, 824–825, 831, 845, 848, 850–852; English, 729, 744, 831, 834, 844–845, 847, 848, 850–852, 854–858; Russian, 740, 745; and Mercantilism, 845–847
Colosseum, 336, 338, 424
Columbus, 706, 721, 722, 726–729
Comitatus, 524
Comitia Curiata, 255; Centuriata, 255; Tributa, 255. *See also "Assembly"*
Commerce, in Bronze Age, 30; Babylonian, 59; Egyptian, 69–70, 74, 166; Cretan, 74, 75–76; Hebrew, 80; Phœnician, 81–82; Assyrian, 88; Greek, 135–136, 139, 151, 153, 166, 181, 183, 208, 211, 232–234; Roman, 249, 266–267, 272, 291, 300, 329, 362–363, 388, 458, 717; Carthaginian, 270–271, 272; Chinese, 98, 390, 398–399, 401, 402, 717, 720; in "Dark Age," 450, 717; Moslem, 514–515, 516, 519–521, 717; medieval European, 530, 543–545, 580, 583, 585–586, 717; Venetian, 656, 657, 717, 748; increased by Crusades, 679, 682, 717; promoted by National States, 683, 709; and Mercantilism, 845–847, 855–856; later medieval and early modern, 704, 716–718, 723–726, 731, 733, 735, 736, 738–744, 746–749, 812, 815, 824–825, 830, 834, 835, 848. *See also "Middle Class"*
Commodus, 345
Commons, House of, 594, 812, 820
Commune, 540 note
Compass, 401, 519, 634, 679, 719
Conciliar Movement, 693–694
Concordats, 694, 800
Concrete, 112, 370
Condottieri, 587
Confirmation, Christian, 624 note

Confucius (Confucianism), 121, 391–393, 395, 396, 736
Conrad III, Emperor, 652–653
Constance, Council of, 785; treaty of, 576
Constans, 348
Constantine I, the Great, 347–348, 429–431, 437, 440, 495, 667
Constantine XI, Emperor, 666–668
Constantinople, 348, 445, 447, 448, 452, 454, 457, 459, 461, 464, 486, 495–502, 511, 514, 650, 656–659, 665–668; Council of, 432; Patriarch of, 434, 437, 461, 489, 502–505, 658, 837
Constantius, 348, 431, 465
Constitution, 684, 815, 858
Consuls, 253, 257, 313, 318, 326
Copernicus, 776
Copper, 28–29, 30, 48, 53, 73, 75, 87, 100, 111
Coptic language, 371
Corcyra, 140, 200
Cordova, 517, 519–521, 603, 645
Corinth, 139, 140, 150, 151, 200, 209, 230, 288, 291, 319, 416, 425, 445
Corinthian Order, 213, 214, 763
Corn, 111, 119
Corneille, 763, 823 note
Coroner, 590
Corpus Juris Civilis, 360
Corsica, 141, 208, 270, 274, 275–276, 281, 283, 295, 299, 583, 853 note
Cortes, Spanish, 603, 708
Cortez, 741–742
Coster, Lourens, 780
Council of Five Hundred, 157–158, 188
Council of Four Hundred, 152, 157
Councils, General Church, 430–432, 561 note, 567; at Lyons, 577; at Clermont, 649; at Florence, 666; at Pisa, 693; at Constance, 693–694, 785; at Basel, 694; at Trent, 798–799
Craft Gilds. *See "Gilds, Craft"*
Cranmer, 763
Crassus, 307, 314, 315
Crécy, battle of, 696
Crete, copper mines in, 30; early towns in, 31; Minoan and Ægean culture of, 73–77; later history of, 126–127, 132, 140, 141, 144, 350, 496, 514, 583, 657, 659, 665, 675
Croatia, 611. *See also "Yugoslavia"*
Crœsus, 139, 153, 165–166
Cro-Magnons, 13–16, 18
Cromwell, Oliver, 814–817; Richard, 815, 817
Crusades, against Moslems, 527, 560–561, 576, 645–679; against Albigenses, 570, 593 note, 599, 614, 687
Ctesiphon, 355
Cuba, 728
Cumæ, 140, 247, 250
Cuneiform, 53–54, 85, 88, 92
Curia Regis, 590, 591
Cuzco, 118, 742
Cyaxares, 92
Cynics, 238, 239
Cynoscephalæ, 287
Cyprus, 30, 75, 76, 82, 83 note, 151, 172, 200, 295 note, 416, 477, 496, 583
Cypselus, 140
Cyrene, 142, 292, 300
Cyril, 506–507
Cyrus, 92, 165–167
Czechoslovakia (Czechs), 507, 508, 514, 540, 571, 610–611, 784–785, 800, 803, 806, 828, 834. *See also "Bohemia," "Moravia"*

Dacia, 341, 353, 442. *See "Rumania"*
Daimios, 738
Damascus, 415, 461, 477, 479, 480, 483, 515, 516, 519, 626, 645, 652, 661, 679, 779
Danes, 506, 510, 512. *See also "Denmark"*
Daniel, 91
Dante, 578, 614, 640, 689
Danube R., 329, 351, 353, 440, 441, 444, 457, 465
Danzig, 581
Dardanelles, 132. *See also "Hellespont"*
Darius I, 167–171, 173, 174, 175
Darius III, 225, 226
"Dark Age," 410, 450, 486–521, 523, 540
Davis, 730
Deacon, 426, 469
Decemviri, 256
Declaration of Independence, American, 857
Delhi, 663
Delian Confederacy, 182–183, 185–186, 199
Della Robbia, 766
Delos, 182, 183, 306

Delphi, 206; oracle of, 156, 165, 178
Demagogues, 211
Demarcation, Papal line of, 748
Demeter, 155
Democracy, Athenian, 157–159, 187–190, 196–199; Roman, 253–259; medieval, 529, 540, 583, 586, 605; early modern, 796, 854, 860, 867
Demosthenes, 215–216, 223
Demotic writing, 41
Denmark, 444, 491, 510, 513, 602, 708, 712, 791, 803, 804, 839. *See also "Danes"*
Diaz, 722, 725
Dictator, Roman, 254, 257, 318, 326
Diet of Holy Roman Empire, 574
Diocese, Roman, 434; ecclesiastical, 559
Diocletian, 346–347, 378, 429
Diogenes, 238
Dionysia, 154, 192
Dionysius of Syracuse, 208
Dionysus, 154–156
Diplomacy, 587
Dissenters, 817–819
Divination, 250
Dog, 23
Doge, of Venice, 581, 584, 656
Dome, 124, 369–370
Domesday Book, 590
Dominic (Dominicans), 560, 561, 568, 622, 626, 800
Domitian, 340, 373
Donatello, 766
Donation of Pepin, 489
Donjon, 533
Dorians, 133, 134, 142, 143
Doric Order, 213, 214, 763
Doris, 147
Draco, 150–151
Drama, Greek, 156, 191–193, 214, 230; medieval, 613
Dravidians, 106
Dublin, 511
Duma, Russian, 837
Dupleix, 851–852
Duquesne, 850, 851
Dürer, 771
Dutch language and literature, 610, 611, 614
Dutch Netherlands. *See "Holland," "Netherlands"*
Dynastic Wars. *See "Wars"*
Dynasty, defined, 38; first Egyptian, 38; fourth, 43, eighteenth, 51, 62
East Anglia, 451
Edessa, 652
Education, Athenian, 191; Roman, 370–371; in "Dark Age," 450, 464, 486, 492–493; Byzantine, 501; Moslem, 516, 519–521; medieval European, 532, 616–622; Humanist, 756; and invention of printing, 781, 867; early modern, 796, 800, 842
Edward I, of England, 593, 596
Edward II, of England, 593
Edward III, of England, 594, 696
Edward IV, of England, 703
Edward VI, of England, 793
Edward, the Confessor, 512
Egbert, 493
Egypt, fertility of, 20; early, 21, 22, 26, 27, 28, 31, 35–49, 50, 60–75, 79–80, 85, 87, 89, 90; later, 104, 132, 135, 151, 165, 166–167, 168, 169, 173, 175, 200, 211, 226, 229, 230, 231–237, 271, 280, 285, 286, 288, 299, 321, 324, 325, 335, 363, 388, 406, 431, 461, 471, 476, 477, 481, 515, 516–517, 645, 653, 668, 677, 679
Einhard, 489
Elam, 56, 57, 87, 91, 99
Elba, 208
Elbe R., 444
Elea, 263
Electors of Holy Roman Empire, 572–573
Electrum, 139
Eleusinian mysteries, 156
Elizabeth, of England, 793, 802, 801, 811, 812
Elysian Fields, 130
Emigration, European, 746
Emperor and Empire. *See "Alexander," "Assyria," "Byzantine," "Charlemagne," "China," "Egypt," "Holy Roman," "India," "Persia," "Roman," etc.*
England, Anglo-Saxon states in, 450–451; Christianized, 468–470; kingdom of, 493; Danish invasion of, 511, 512; Norman conquest of, 512; industry in, 546; Church in, 567; Jews banished from, 570; cities in, 580; becomes a nation, 589–594; common law of, 629; in Hundred Years' War, 690–691, 694–702; Wars of the Roses in, 702–703; under Tudors, 703–704, 730, 744,

784, 792–794, 802, 804, 805, 811; classical revival in, 757, 764–765, 766; under Stuarts, 811–820, 826, 830, 834, 847–849; under Hanoverians, 820–821, 849–852, 854–858. *For early history, see "Britain"*
English language and literature, 594, 610, 611, 615, 761, 763, 793
Eoliths, 6
Epaminondas, 210
Ephesus, 416, 425, 665
Ephors, 144
Epicurus (Epicureanism, Epicureans), 239, 330, 331, 431
Epirus, 264, 445
Episcopal Church. *See "Anglicanism"*
Erasmus, 757–758, 771, 785
Eratosthenes, 235
Erechtheum, 182
Eretria, 139, 172, 174
Eridu, 54
Essarhaddon, 87
Essex, 451
Estates General, of France, 600, 705, 821
Esthonia, 580, 806, 839
Ethelbert, 467
Ethiopia, 167, 168
Etruria, 136, 246–247. *See also "Etruscans"*
Etruscans, 136, 246–247, 248, 249, 250–251, 254, 260–262, 263
Eubœa, 139, 147, 174
Eucharist, sacrament of, 624 note
Euclid, 236–237, 633, 737 note
Euripides, 193
Eusebius, 437
Excommunication, 565 note
Exodus, 80
Exploration, European, in Asia, 719–726; in Africa, 724–725, 744–745; in America, 726–730

Fabius, 278–279
Fairs, medieval, 544
"Far East," defined, 715
"Far West," defined, 715
Farming. *See "Agriculture"*
Fasces, 254
Fatima, 516
Fatimid (Fatimite), family, 517, 645, 646, 647–648, 653
Fayum, 48
Ferdinand, Emperor, 711
Ferdinand, of Aragon, 673, 704, 706, 711, 766
Ferghana, 398
Feudalism, Egyptian, 48; Chinese, 393; Japanese, 738; medieval European, 523–533, 541–543, 558, 562, 572, 589–590, 597–599, 602, 652, 658, 694–696; decline of, 682–683, 686, 703, 705, 706, 823
Fiefs, 526
Filipinos, 740. *See also "Philippine Islands"*
Finland (Finns), 440, 806, 839; language, 611
Fire, 9
Firearms, 685, 709
Flanders, 585, 599, 601, 602, 604, 650, 658, 694, 695, 704, 831. *See also "Netherlands"*
Flemish language and literature, 610, 611, 614
Florence, 557, 581, 583–584, 614, 685, 756, 765, 766, 768, 770; Council of, 666
Florida, 730, 844, 858
Forum, Roman, 308, 370
Fossils, 5
Fox, George, 798
France, Gaul transformed into, 466, 487, 494; *see "Merovingian," "Carolingian"*; Moslems in, 477–478, 481; Normans in, 511; Jews banished from, 570; cities in, 580; English possessions in, 596; consolidation of, 596–601; in Crusades, 650, 652, 654, 672; and Hundred Years' War, 694–702; in later Middle Age and early modern times, 704–706, 711–712, 730, 744, 794, 796, 800, 802, 804–805, 806; classical revival in, 757, 764, 766, 768, 770–771; under Bourbons, 796, 803, 804, 821–833, 834, 845, 847–853, 857–858. *For early history, see "Gaul"*
Franche Comté, 828, 830, 831
Francis I, of France, 712, 730, 757, 758, 764, 766, 768, 770, 775, 794
Francis of Assisi (Franciscans), 560, 561, 609, 614, 622, 633, 640, 719–720, 721, 800
Francis Xavier, 726, 738
Franconian Emperors, 572, 575
Frankfort, 557, 574
Franklin, 855

Franks, 443, 447, 450, 452, 454, 459, 466, 486–494
Frederick I "Barbarossa," Emperor, 575–576, 584, 609, 653
Frederick II, Emperor, 576–577, 580, 604, 719
Frederick I, of Prussia, 841
Frederick II, the Great, of Prussia, 842–844, 849–850, 853, 859–860
Frederick, Elector, 803
Frederick William, Great Elector, 841
Frederick William I, of Prussia, 841–842
Freeholders on a manor, 535
French language and literature, 494, 512, 610, 611, 613–614, 761, 762–763, 823
French Revolution, 858, 860, 867
Friars, 561, 614
Frobisher, 730
Froissart, 614
Fulda, 506

Gaiseric, 446–447
Galatia, 292, 416
Galen, 372
Galerius, 429–430
Galileo, 776–777
Gallic Wars, 297–299
Games, in medieval Europe, 539
Gascony, 557, 695–696
Gaul, Cisalpine, 278, 296, 297, 300; Transalpine, 141, 296, 298, 299, 300, 319, 324, 329, 341, 350, 363, 429, 442, 446, 447, 448, 452, 453, 457, 459
Gauls, 261–262, 277, 278, 296. *See also "Gaul"*
Gautama Buddha, 382–384
Gela, 180
Gelon, 180
Geneva, 795, 796, 797, 798
Genoa, 557, 581, 583, 659, 666, 670, 721, 727, 729, 748
Genseric. *See "Gaiseric"*
Gentiles, 416
Geography, 235, 373, 616, 631, 632, 678–679, 719
Geometry, 73, 217, 237, 616, 633, 737
George I, of England, 819, 820, 821, 834
George II, of England, 821, 834
George III, of England, 834, 854–856
Georgia, 854
German language and literature, 440, 451, 464, 465, 494, 610, 611, 613, 614–615, 761, 762
Germanic Law. *See "Law, Germanic"*
Germans, early, 106, 297, 298, 340, 351, 353, 374, 440–442; invasion of Roman Empire by, 442–448, 458, 470, 524; establishment of kingdoms by, 449–454, 458; conversion to Christianity of, 462–470. *For later history, see "Germany," "France," "England," etc.*
Germany, kingdom of, 494, 571–572; Christianized, 505. *For earlier history, see "Germans"; for later history, see "Holy Roman Empire," "Austria," "Bavaria," "Prussia," etc.*
Geza, 514
Ghent, 581, 585
Ghibellines, 577, 583
Ghiberti, 766
Gibraltar, 446, 477 note, 848
Gilds, 307; craft, 545–549, 583; merchant, 545; university, 619–620
Giotto, 566, 640
Glacial Ages, 9–10, 18, 19
Gladiators, 314, 318, 333, 335, 341, 345, 435
Glass, invention of, 71
Gnesen, 507, 509
Goa, 731, 736
Gobi, desert of, 98, 396, 402, 721
Godfrey of Bouillon, 650
Gods, Greek and Roman, 331. *See also "Athena," "Zeus," "Jupiter," etc.*
Golden Bull, of Holy Roman Empire, 572–573; Hungarian, 602, 603
Golden Horde, 663
Gothic architecture, 637–640; type, 780
Goths, 444, 464–465. *See also "Ostrogoths," "Visigoths"*
Government, Egyptian, 45–46, 49, 71, 124; Sumerian, 54, 55; Babylonian, 57; Cretan, 74–75; Assyrian, 87–88, 93, 124; Chinese, 101–102, 392, 393, 394; Inca, 117; early Greek, 128; Spartan, 144; Athenian, 150, 152–153, 157–159, 187–190, 196–199; of other Greek city-states, 205; Persian, 161–171; of Roman Republic, 253–259, 303–327; of Roman Empire, 334–337, 338, 339, 340, 345–348, 357–358; of India,

385; of Christian Church, 425–427, 434; early German, 441, 449; Mongol, 456; Moslem, 476; of Charlemagne's Empire, 491–492; Byzantine, 498–499; of medieval cities, 541–543, 573–574, 586–587; in Middle Age, 557–558, 605; of Holy Roman Empire, 572–574; medieval English, 590, 591–594; medieval French, 597–601; medieval Spanish, 603–604; of Ottoman Empire, 670–671; modern English, 819–821; Russian, 837–838; Prussian, 841
Gracchan tax law, 294
Gracchus, Caius, 309; Tiberius, 309–310
Granada, 520, 603, 673, 706, 728
Gratian, 561 note, 609
Great Britain, 819. *For Roman period see "Britain"; for later history, see "England," "Scotland"*
Great Mother, 76
Great Northern War, 839
Great Powers, 833–835, 844
Greece, Cretan colonization in, 74, 75, 76; Phœnicians in, 82; ancient history to 500 B.C., 122–159; 5th century B.C., 171–202; 4th century B.C. and Hellenistic period, 205–254, 285–286; Roman period, 286–293, 300, 330, 343, 346, 348–349, 367, 371; invaded by Visigoths, 445, 459. *For later history, see "Byzantine Empire," "Church, Eastern (Orthodox)"*
Greek Church. *See "Church, Eastern (Orthodox)"*
Greek Fire, 496
Greek language and literature, 83, 106, 128, 137–138, 192–193, 196, 214–222, 230, 234–235, 304, 371–373, 374, 437, 459, 464, 496, 501–503, 610, 752, 754, 755–756
Greeks, 107, 133. *See also "Greece"*
Greenland, 513, 718
"Greens," 500
Gregory I, the Great, Pope, 467, 564
Gregory II, Pope, 506
Gregory VII, Pope, 564–565, 575, 648
Gregory XIII, Pope, 777 note
Grindstone, 25
Guelph, 577, 578, 583, 584
Guesclin, Bertrand du, 697
Guido, 640–641
Guienne, 557, 601, 695–696
Gunpowder, 634, 686
Gupta dynasty, 388–389; empire, 380
Gustavus Adolphus, of Sweden, 803, 835
Gustavus Vasa, of Sweden, 708
Gutenberg, 780

Haarlem, 780
Habsburg family, 572, 578, 579, 708, 710–712, 827–828, 831, 834, 841, 844, 847–849
Hadrian, 342–343, 353, 370, 371
Halys R., 84, 92, 165
Hamburg, 506, 509, 513, 557, 581
Hamilcar, 275, 276
Hammurabi, 57–59, 96
Han dynasty, 395, 400, 410
Hannibal, 277–282, 287, 288
Hanover, 819
Hanse (Hanseatic League), 585–586, 748
Harold, 589
Harun al-Rashid, 516, 518
Hasdrubal, 280
Hatshepshut, 70
Heavenly Emperors, 99
Hebrews. *See "Jews"*
Hegira, 475–476
Heidelberg jawbone, 7 note
Helen of Troy, 130, 131
Hellas, 134. *See also "Greece"*
Hellenes, 133. *See also "Greece"*
Hellenic League, 177, 223
Hellenistic civilization, 229–240, 285, 300, 367
Hellespont, 175, 200. *See also "Dardanelles"*
Heloïse, 619
Helots, 145, 186, 210
Helvetians, 297, 298
Henry IV, Emperor, 565, 575, 697, 702
Henry V, Emperor, 575, 598, 697–698, 702
Henry VII, Emperor, 578
Henry II, of England, 590–591, 596, 598
Henry III, of England, 593
Henry IV, of England, 784
Henry V, of England, 784
Henry VI, of England, 698, 700, 702, 703
Henry VII, of England, 703–704, 706, 729, 757, 766

Henry VIII, of England, 757, 758, 792–793, 794, 797, 804, 812
Henry IV, of France, 796, 805, 821
Henry, the Navigator, Prince, 723–725
Henry, Patrick, 855
Hera, 130, 148, 331 note
Heraclea, 263
Heracles (Heraclids), 133
Heraclius, 461, 477, 497, 669
Herculaneum, 213 note, 374
Heresy (Heretic), Christian, 428–429, 431–434, 479, 568–571, 783, 790, 794, 802; Moslem, 645, 668
Hermæ, 201
Hermes of Praxiteles, 212, 213
Herod, 411
Herodotus, 196
Herophilus, 236
Hesse, 506
Hieratic writing, 41
Hieroglyphs, Egyptian, 39, 41
Hildebrand. *See "Gregory VII, Pope"*
Himera, 180–181
Hinduism (Hindus), 381, 388, 389, 457. *See also "Brahmanism," "Religion, Hindu"*
Hippalus, 388
Hippias, 173, 174
Hippo, 437
Hippocrates, 204, 217–218
Hippodrome, 500, 658
Hissarlik, 131
History, definition, 1, 4; continuity, 2; recorded and unrecorded, 4; 609, 614, 760
Hittites, 30, 59, 79, 84–85, 88, 95, 106
Hohenstaufen family, 572, 575–577, 604
Hohenzollern family, 579, 840–841, 844, 849
Holland, 443, 451, 711, 749, 796, 797, 802, 803, 806, 826, 828, 830, 831, 835, 846 note, 847, 848, 849, 858. *See also "Netherlands"*
Holy Land. *See "Jerusalem" and "Palestine"*
Holy Roman Empire, 495, 526, 565, 571–580, 708, 710–712, 802–803, 828, 830, 834, 841
Holy Sepulchre, 648, 651, 652
Homage, 525
Homer, 31, 128–132, 137, 138, 154, 235, 756, 758
Hoplite, 151, 152–153, 175
Horace, 330, 419
Horse, 23, 34, 61–62, 84
Hortensian Law, 258
Hospitals, 435, 553
Hsiung Nu, 394, 396, 397, 398
Hudson, 730
Hudson's Bay, 848
Hugh Capet, 494, 597, 600
Huguenots, 796, 802, 804–805, 822, 826
Humanism, 758, 771, 772, 773, 786
Hundred Years' War, 601, 689, 694–702, 709
Hungary (Hungarians, Magyars), 444, 457, 458, 491, 494, 509, 513–514, 540, 601, 602, 646, 660, 661, 666, 670, 672, 675, 676, 711, 796, 800, 804, 806, 828, 834; language and literature, 611, 615
Huns, 101, 444, 452, 457–458, 459, 470, 646, 660
Huss (Hussites), 784–785, 790
Hyksos, 60–62
Hymns, 641

Ice Age, 9–10, 18
Iceland, 511, 513, 718
Iconoclasm, 503–504
Ignatius Loyola, 799–800
Ikhnaton, 67
Iliad, 128
Illuminated manuscripts, 640
Illyria, 276, 281, 297, 300, 329, 459
Illyricum, 431. *See "Illyria"*
Imperator, 318, 326, 334
Imperium, 254
Inca Empire, 117–119, 742–743
Independents, 812, 814
India, early history of, 103–109; Persians in, 168, 169; Greeks in, 227, 384–385, 715; Buddhism in, 381–384; Maurya Empire of, 385–388; Gupta Empire of, 388–389; in contact with China, 399–401; Moslem trade with, 519; Mongols in, 663–664; Moslems in, 677, 715; Europeans in, 725–726, 731–733, 735, 800, 851–852; Mogul Empire of, 733–734
Indians, American, 109–119, 120, 729, 740–744
Indo-China, 402
Indulgences, 687, 780, 785, 786, 788
Industry, in Stone Age, 8, 11, 14, 17, 24–31; Egyptian, 37, 43, 47, 69;

in ancient Mesopotamia, 52, 58; Cretan, 75; Hittite, 84; Assyrian, 88, 92; in India, 108; in ancient America, 111–112, 117; Greek, 123–124, 151, 153, 154, 197–198, 211–212, 233–234, 237–238; Roman, 304–305, 306, 307–308, 329, 363, 364, 365–366, 398–399; Moslem, 516, 519–521; medieval European, 530, 545–549, 552; early modern, 679, 824, 838, 860, 867
Innocent III, Pope, 566–568, 654, 657, 686, 687
Inquisition, medieval, 569–570; Spanish, 674, 706, 799, 801, 805; Italian, 777, 799, 801
Interdict, 565 note
Interest, 59, 522 note, 795
Inventions, of Old Stone Age, 17; of New Stone Age, 24–31; Hellenistic, 237–238; Roman, 365; Moslem, 519; medieval European, 634; of Printing, 402–403, 615, 777–781
Investiture, 525; conflict, 565, 575
Iona, 509
Ionia (Ionians), 134, 135, 137, 149, 156, 165, 166, 171–173, 175, 182, 209, 213, 225
Ionic Order, 213, 214, 763
Irak, 647. *See "Mesopotamia"*
Iranians, 91–93. *See "Persia"*
Ireland, 470, 493, 505, 510, 511, 567, 596, 794, 806, 815, 818
Iron, 30–31, 34, 86, 87, 98, 103, 104, 133, 389–390; Age, 83–84
Irrigation, ancient, 46, 52, 58, 59, 111
Isabella, of Castile, 673, 704, 706, 711, 727–728, 766
Ishtar, 89
Isidore of Seville, 617 note
Isis, 420, 421
Islam. *See "Mohammed," "Religion, Moslem"*
Issus, 225
Isthmian games, 287 note
Italian language and literature, 610, 614, 761, 762
Italy, copper mines in, 30; Greek colonies in, 136, 140, 141, 208, 247–248; in Stone and Bronze Ages, 244–245; Etruscans in, 246–247; early Roman history of, 248–259; unification of, by Rome, 259–268; under Roman Republic, 270–331; under Roman Empire, 334–376; Germans in, 445–448, 453, 458, 459, 465; raided by Hungarians, 514; cities in, 581–585. *For later history, see "Florence," "Genoa," "Holy Roman Empire," "Milan," "Naples," "Pope," "Sicily," "Venice"*
Iyeyasu, 739

Jaffa, 651, 654
Jahan, 734
James I, of England, 811–812, 817
James II, of England, 817–819
James VI, of Scotland, 708, 811
Janissary, 671
Janus, 252, 331 note
Japan, 103, 120, 383, 400–1, 455, 661, 715, 721, 726, 738–739, 749, 779
Java, 661, 677, 726, 739
Java skull (Pithecanthropus erectus), 7 note
Jefferson, 857
Jehovah, 81
Jenghiz Khan, 660–661, 663, 664, 719
Jerome, 437–438, 608, 622
Jerusalem, 80, 91, 169, 340, 414, 415, 421, 425, 426, 434, 461, 477, 482, 483, 647–648, 651–654, 660, 661
Jesuits, 799–800
Jesus, 81, 331, 411–415, 431, 441, 474
Jews, 31, 79–82, 90–91, 169, 340, 411–418, 420, 471, 473, 475, 476; in medieval Europe, 570, 610, 674; in Ottoman Empire, 672. *See also "Palestine"*
Jimmu Tenno, 103
Joan of Arc, 698–700, 704
John, Apostle, 428
John Chrysostom, 437
John, of Austria, 675
John, of England, 567, 591–593, 598
John of Monte Corvino, 721
John of Plano Carpini, 720
John Sobieski, of Poland, 675
John XII, Pope, 495
Joinville, 614
Jongleurs, 613
Jonson, Ben, 763
Joshua, 80
Journeymen, 547
Judæa, 411
Judaism. *See "Jews," "Religion, Jewish"*
Jugoslavs. *See "Yugoslavia"*

Jugurtha, 311
Julian, 348, 431–432
Julius Cæsar. *See "Cæsar, Julius"*
Julius II, Pope, 770
Juno, 252, 331
Jupiter, 252, 331
Juries, Athenian, 152, 189; English, 591, 819
Justinian, 348–349, 359–362, 377, 399, 452–454, 459, 461, 465, 495, 497, 628, 669
Jutes, 444, 447
Juvenal, 374

Kalmar, Union of, 708
Karnak, 63
Kassa, Pact of, 603
Kassites, 60, 61, 85, 86
Kedessia, 478
Kent, 451, 467, 468
Kepler, 776
Khufu, 43–45
Kiev, 507, 508, 509, 511, 512, 610, 661
Knights, Roman, 305–306; medieval, 527, 531, 532, 617
Knights Hospitalers of St. John, 561
Knights Templars, 561, 600
Knights, Teutonic, 561, 580, 841
Knossos, 74–77
Knox, John, 797
Koran, 473–474
Korea, 102–103, 396, 400, 401, 402, 661, 721, 777
Kossovo, battle of, 665
Krum, 497
Kshatriyas, 108
Kublai Khan, 663, 720–721
K'ung Fu Tzu. *See "Confucius"*
Kurds, 653, 664, 670

Labor. *See "Agriculture," "Collegia," "Commerce," "Gilds," "Industry," "Serfdom," "Slavery"*
Lacedæmon, 130, 142. *See also "Sparta"*
Laconia, 142. *See also "Sparta"*
Ladislaus I, of Poland, 603
La Fontaine, 763, 823
Laity, defined, 492 note
Lake-dwellers, 24, 34
Lancaster family, 697, 700, 702–703
Land problem, in Roman Republic, 253, 258–259, 262, 265, 284–285, 303–304, 309–311; in Roman Empire, 364–365
Langton, Stephen, 567, 593
Languages, earliest, 17, 33; Aryan or Indo-European, 105, 162 note, 611; Semitic, 479; Turanian, 611; Romance or Romanic, 350, 610; Germanic or Teutonic, 610; Slavic, 610–611; Celtic, 611. *See also "Greek," "Latin," "Sanskrit"*
Lao Tzu, 390–391
Laocoön, 231, 232
Lares, 252
Larsa, 54
Las Navas de Tolosa, battle of, 673
Lateran, 569; Council of, 567
Latifundia, 364
Latin Church. *See "Church, Western (Catholic)"*
Latin language and literature, 106, 245, 267, 329–330, 349, 371, 373–375, 437, 450, 459, 464, 466, 493, 503, 508, 608–610, 616, 621, 752–760, 793
Latium, 245, 249, 262
Latvia, 580, 806, 839
Law, of Hammurabi, 58–59; Spartan, 144; Athenian, 150; Roman, 253, 256, 358–362, 449, 528, 609, 619, 627, 628–629, 684, 753; Canon, 431, 561–562, 609, 619, 627–628; Germanic, 449–450, 628; English Common, 629, 854
Lebanon, 56
Lechfeld, battle of, 514
Legion, 259
Legnano, battle of, 576, 584
Leningrad, 839
Leo III, Emperor, 503–504, 505
Leo I, the Great, Pope, 458
Leo III, Pope, 491
Leo IX, Pope, 564
Leo X, Pope, 756–757, 758, 770, 786, 790, 792
Leonard of Pisa, 634
Leonardo da Vinci, 767, 768
Leonidas, 177
Lepanto, battle of, 675
Lepidus, 323, 324
Lesbos, 137
Leuctra, 210
Liberal Arts, 616–617
Liberum Veto, 709
Libya, 167, 168
Licinian Laws, 258
Lictors, 254
Liguria, 296

Lille, 830
Linen, 27–28
Lisbon, 673
Literature. *See "Languages," "Greek," "Latin," etc.*
Lithuania, 603, 611, 806
Livy, 330, 419
Locri, 200, 263
Locris, 147
Lollards, 784
Lombard League, 576, 584, 585
Lombards, 444, 454, 459, 465, 470, 489, 490, 540
Lombardy, 585
London, 593
Lope de Vega, 762
Lord of a manor, 533–534, 538
Lords, House of, 594
Lorraine, 494, 650, 853 note. *See "Lotharingia"*
Lot, selection of officials by, 189
Lothar, 494
Lotharingia, 494, 514. *See "Lorraine"*
Louis, the Pious, Emperor, 494, 506
Louis IV, Emperor, 578
Louis VI, of France, 598, 609
Louis VII, of France, 609, 652–653
Louis IX, of France, 599, 614, 638, 719, 720
Louis XI, of France, 705–706, 709, 711
Louis XIII, of France, 821
Louis XIV, of France, 821–833, 834, 835, 845, 847, 848, 853, 860
Louis XV, of France, 833, 834, 853, 860
Louis XVI, of France, 833, 834, 857
Louis, the German, 494
Louisburg, 850
Louisiana, 852
Louvain, 548
Louvois, 827
Louvre, 601, 764, 767
Lübeck, 557, 581, 585
Lucretius, 756
Luke, 428
Luther (Lutherans, Lutheranism), 763, 788–792, 794, 795, 796, 800, 801, 802
Luxemburg, 557, 830
Lyceum, 220
Lycurgus, 143–144
Lydia, 139, 165–166
Macao, 736, 737
Macedonia, 140, 222–229, 230, 281, 285, 286–288, 290, 291, 300, 416, 459, 477. *For later history, see "Byzantine Empire"*
Machiavelli, 684–685, 710, 759, 762
Madeira Is., 270, 725
Madras, 721
Mæander R., 135
Mæcenas, 330
Magdeburg, 557
Magellan, 722, 729–730, 740
Magic, 55, 67, 407, 630
Magna Carta, 591–593, 602, 813 note
Magna Græcia, 247, 263–264. *See also "Colonies, Greek"*
Magnesia, 288
Magyars. *See "Hungary"*
Main R., 297
Maine, 744
Mainz, 557, 573, 780, 788
Maize. *See "Corn"*
Malay archipelago, 383, 401, 739
Malindi, 725
Malory, Sir Thomas, 615
Mamluks, 661, 668
Manchu dynasty, 737
Manchuria, 101, 402
Manila, 740
Manilian Law, 294, 305
Manor, medieval, 533–537, 543–544
Manufactures. *See "Industry"*
Manzikert, battle of, 646
Marathon, battle of, 174–175, 181; races, 174
Marcus Aurelius, 343–344, 371
Mardonius, 179
Maria Theresa, of Austria, 843, 849–850, 852, 853
Marius, 297, 311, 312, 315
Mark, 428
Marlowe, 763
Marriage, Christian, 624 note
Mars, 252, 331
Marseilles, 141. *See also "Massilia"*
Marsic War, 311
Marsiglio of Padua, 689
Martianus Capella, 617 note
Mary I, of England, 793, 802, 804
Mary II, of England, 818–819, 847
Mary Stuart, of Scotland, 804
Maryland, 804, 854
Masinissa, 281, 282

Massachusetts, 744, 797, 804, 845, 854, 856
Massilia, 141, 299 note
Masters, 547–549
Mathematics, 519. *See also "Algebra," "Arithmetic," "Geometry"*
Matilda, Countess, 575
Matthew, 428
Mauretania, 299
Maurya Empire, 385–388
Maximilian, Emperor, 710–711, 771
Mayapan, League of, 114
Mayas, 112–114, 116, 120
Mayor of the Palace, 488, 738
Mazarin, Cardinal, 821, 822, 828
Mazda, 93, 163, 167, 355, 420, 421. *See also "Ahura Mazda"*
Mecca, 473, 475–6, 479, 516, 519, 669
Medes, 89, 91, 92, 164
Media, 87, 91, 92, 165, 168
Medici family, 584, 756, 765, 770
Medicine, 124, 217–218, 619, 631
Medina, 476, 477, 479, 645, 669
Mediterranean, importance to Roman Empire, 349
Megalithic culture, 34
Meistersingers, 613
Memphis, 45
Mencius, 409
Mendicant Orders, 561
Menelaus, 130, 142
Meneptah, 80
Menes, 42
Menno (Mennonites), 797, 801
Mercantilism, 845–847, 855–856
Merchant Gilds. *See "Gilds, Merchant"*
Merchants. *See "Commerce"*
Mercia, 451
Merovingian family, 487–488, 738
Merovius, 487
Merv, 646
Mesco, 507
Mesopotamia, metals in, 29; early towns in, 31; ancient fertility of, 49–52; Sumerian and Babylonian civilization in, 52–59; Kassite rule of, 60, 62; Assyrian Empire in, 85–90; new Babylonian Empire in, 90–91; Persian conquest of, 166; Macedonian conquest of, 226; under Seleucids, 230, 288; under Rome, 354; under Parthia, 354; under Persia, 461; under Arabs, 471, 476, 479, 481, 515; under Turks, 646, 653; raided by Mongols, 661; Moslem, 677
Messenia, 143; Revolt of, 186
Messiah, 81, 412, 414
Metals, first use of, 28–31
Metaurus R., 280
Metics, 199
Metz, 712
Mexico, 111, 114–117, 715, 741–742, 806, 844
Michael Palæologus, Emperor, 659
Michelangelo, 763, 768–770, 786
"Middle Age," 523–641
Middle Class, 683–684, 703, 747, 795, 812, 822
"Middle East," defined, 715
Mikado, 738
Milan, 437, 557, 581, 584–585, 638, 711, 712, 768; edict of, 430
Miletus, 135–137, 150, 151, 172, 173
Millet, 672
Miltiades, 174, 175, 186 note
Milton, 763
Ming dynasty, 723, 726, 736
Ming-ti, 399
Minnesingers, 613
Minoan Age and Culture, 74–77, 96, 126
Minorca, 848, 858
Minos, 74
Missi dominici, 491
Mithradates, 292, 293, 295
Model Parliament, 593
Mœsia, 447, 459, 465, 496
Mogul Empire, 664, 733–734, 851
Mohacs, battle of, 670
Mohammed, 402, 470, 473–476, 515, 516
Mohammed II, Sultan, 666–668, 672
Mohammed IV, Sultan, 675
Mohammedanism. *See "Religion, Moslem"*
Molière, 763, 823 note
Monaco, 141
Monasticism, Buddhist, 387; Christian, 462–470, 505–509, 528, 553–554, 560–561, 618, 640–641; attacks on, 785, 790, 793, 807
Money, 45, 70, 109, 138–139, 145, 151, 153, 154, 161, 232–233, 234, 266
Mongolia, 97–98, 101, 400, 661, 719–720
Mongols, 97–98, 101, 103, 444, 454, 455, 459, 473, 496, 660, 661–663. *See also "Mogul Empire"*

Monotheism, 81
Monsoons, 388
Monte Cassino, 462–463, 626
Montezuma, 742
Montfort, Simon de, 593
Montreal, 730, 851
Moors, 452, 477, 515, 516, 645, 669. *See also "Morocco"*
Moravia, 507. *See also "Czechoslovakia"*
Moravian Brethren, 785
More, Thomas, 757, 759, 763
Moriscoes, 674
Morocco, 477, 516, 645, 669, 674. *See also "Moors"*
Mosaics, 231, 368
Moscow, 610, 661, 835
Moslems. *See "Religion, Moslem"*
Münster, 557, 797
Murillo, 771
Muscovy, 835
Museum, 234
Music, Egyptian, 42; Sumerian, 54; Cretan, 76; Greek, 138, 156, 186, 191–192; medieval European, 609–610, 616, 617, 640–641; early modern, 772, 825
Mutiny Act, 819 note
Mycenæ, 76, 126, 127, 128, 129, 132, 140, 160
Mycenæan Age, 127, 160
Mylæ, 274
Mytilene, 137, 150

Nanking, 401, 737
Nantes, edict of, 796, 805, 826
Naples, 263, 557, 604, 711, 712
Narmer, 42
Narva, battle of, 839
National States, 557, 559, 580, 587–605, 748
Nationalism, 684
Naucratis, 135
Navarre, 712
Navy, Cretan, 75–76; Phœnician, 82; Persian, 173, 175, 178–179; Athenian, 176, 178–179, 183, 199; Carthaginian, 180; Roman, 273–274, 349–350; Norman, 509–513; Saracen, 514–515; Venetian, 583; Hanseatic, 585–586; Turkish, 670, 675; English, 802; French, 825
Nazareth, 411
Neanderthalers, 7, 11–13, 18
"Near East," defined, 20, 715
Nearchus, 227
Nebuchadrezzar, 90–91
Negroes, 404, 677, 715, 745
Nemean games, 287 note
Neolithic Age, 20–32
Nepotism, 688, 786
Nero, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 373
Nerva, 340
Netherlands, 540, 571, 581, 585, 599, 602, 604, 610, 711, 712, 764, 771, 796, 802, 803, 806, 828, 830, 831, 846 note. *See also "Belgium," "Dutch," "Flanders," "Flemish," "Holland"*
Neustria, 487, 488, 494
New Amsterdam, 744
New England, 730, 744, 797, 854
"New Learning," 757, 786
New Stone Age. *See "Neolithic Age"*
New York, 740
Newfoundland, 730, 848
Niagara, 850
Nibelungenlied, 613
Nice, 141
Nicæa, 647, 650, 659, 665; Council of, 430–431
Nicholas II, Pope, 564
Nicholas V, Pope, 756
Nicomedia, 665
Nike of Samothrace, 231
Nile R., 6, 36–37. *See also "Egypt"*
Nimwegen, treaty of, 830
Nineveh, 88, 89–90
Nippur, 54
Nirvana, 383–384
Nomads, 444, 454–458, 459, 460, 471, 513–514, 517, 646, 660, 677
Nomarchs, 45–46
Nomes, 45
Nominalism, 625
Noricum, 351
Normandy, 511, 557, 589, 594, 596, 598, 650, 698
Normans, 510
Northmen, 510
Northumbria, 451
Norway, 510, 513, 602, 708, 791
Nova Scotia, 730, 744, 848
Novgorod, 511, 512
Nubia, 62, 63, 70, 164
Numidia, 281, 282, 300, 311
Nuremberg, 557
Nystad, treaty of, 839

Octavian, 323–331
Oder R., 444, 579
Odoacer (Odovacar), 448
Odysseus, 128
Odyssey, 128
Oligarchy, 142, 144, 147, 156, 206, 209
Olympian games, 206, 287 note, 432
Omar, 476
Omayyad family, 476, 479, 483, 515, 516, 517, 645
Oratory, Greek, 214–215
Orders, sacrament of, 624 note
Orleans, 597, 698, 700
Orpheus, 155, 156
Orthodox. *See "Church, Eastern (Orthodox)"*
Osiris, 65, 66
Osman. *See "Othman"*
Ostracism, 159; of Aristides, 176; of Cimon, 186; of Themistocles, 185
Ostrogoths, 444, 447–448, 452, 454, 457, 465
Othman, 476, 664
Otis, James, 855
Otto of Freising, 609
Otto, the Great, Emperor, 495, 514, 571
Ottoman Empire, 665–672, 675–676, 712, 839, 840, 853
Ovid, 330, 331, 419
Oxford, University of, 619, 620, 633, 784
Oxus valley, 397

Padua, University of, 776
Paganism, 407, 419–424, 432, 483, 486. *See also "Religion, Greek and Roman (Pagan)"*
Painting, Palæolithic, 15; Neolithic, 27; Egyptian, 64–65; Cretan, 75; Greek, 124, 132, 193, 195; Hellenistic, 213; Roman, 367–368; Chinese, 400, 401, 402; medieval, 640; early modern, 766–771, 774
Palæolithic Age, 6–17, 32, 33
Palatinate, War of, 830–831, 847–848
Palestine, 62, 63, 77, 80, 90–91, 166, 288, 295, 411, 580, 645, 646, 648, 668
Palestrina, 772
Panama, 729, 742
Panem et circenses, 335
P'an-ku, 99
Pannonia, 351, 442, 447
Pantheon, 369, 370
Papacy. *See "Pope"*
Paper, 396, 679, 778–779
Papyrus, 41, 82, 221, 233, 370, 778
Paraguay, 800
Paris (of Troy), 130
Paris, 494, 557, 597, 609, 638; University of, 619, 620, 623, 626, 633, 755; treaty of (1763), 852; treaty of (1783), 858
Parish, 559
Parlement, of Paris, 599
Parliament, medieval, 682; English, 593–594, 704, 792–793, 812–821, 834, 855–856; Scottish, 596, 819; Polish, 709. *See also "Cortes," "Diet," "Estates General"*
Paros, 154
Parthenon, 120, 122, 193–194
Parthian Empire, 341 note, 354–355, 388, 398, 460
Patesi, 54, 57
Patriarchate, 434. *See also "Constantinople, Patriarch of," "Pope"*
Patricians, Roman, 252; in medieval cities, 581
Patriotism, National, 684, 787
Patronage, 524
Paul, Apostle, 415–419, 424, 425, 426, 427
Paul the Lombard, 492
Pax Romana, 300, 355–356
Peace of God, 530
Peasants' Revolt, in Germany, 791
Peking, 720, 721, 723, 737
Peloponnesian League, 146–147, 177, 206
Peloponnesian War, 200–202
Peloponnesus, 130
Penance, Sacrament of, 624 note
Penn, William, 855
Pennsylvania, 854
Pepin, 488–489
Pergamum, 230, 231, 286, 288, 292
Periander, 140–141
Pericles, 186–187, 190, 193, 194, 197, 199, 200, 201
Pericœci, 145
Peripatetics, 220–221
Per-o, 43
Persephone, 130, 155
Persepolis, 227
Perseus of Macedonia, 290, 291
Persia (Persians), 31, 87, 90, 91–93, 162–179, 182, 201, 209, 225–227, 288, 316, 319, 324, 355, 398, 402,

452, 457, 460–461, 470, 478–479, 481–482, 515, 517, 645, 661, 664, 668
Peru, 117–119, 715, 742–743
Peter, Apostle, 415, 418, 421, 426–427, 428, 432, 433, 687 note
Peter I, the Great, of Russia, 835–840, 853
Peter Lombard, 623–624
Peter of Pisa, 492
Peter the Hermit, 650
Petrarch, 614, 754–756, 758, 761
Phalanx, 85, 139, 222–223, 251, 259
Pharaoh, 43. *See also "Egypt"*
Pharsalus, 317
Pheidippides, 174
Phidias, 120, 194, 195, 200
Philhellenism, 283–284
Philip of Macedonia, 222–223
Philip V, of Macedonia, 286–287
Philip II, Augustus, of France, 598–599, 653
Philip IV, the Fair, of France, 599–601, 689
Philip VI, of France, 696
Philip I, of Spain, 711
Philip II, of Spain, 735, 740, 749, 764, 771, 796, 801–802, 835
Philippi, 324
Philippides, 174
Philippine Islands, 730, 740, 806, 835, 844
Philistines, 31, 79
Philosophy, Greek, 136–137, 216–217, 218–222, 238–240; Roman, 330, 343, 371–372; medieval, 625–627
Phocis, 147, 200
Phœnicians, 81–83, 140, 166, 173, 175, 226, 247, 273. *See also "Carthage"*
Photius, 504
Phrygians, 85
Physics, 617, 632
Piltdown skull, 7 note
Pindar, 196, 224
Piræus, 184–185
Pirates, 294. *See also "Saracens"*
Pitt, William, 850
Pittsburgh, 850, 851
Pisa, 581, 583, 635, 637; Council of, 693
Pisistratus, 153–156
Pius V, Pope, 675
Pizarro, 742
Plassey, battle of, 852
Platæa, 179
Plato, 219–220, 757
Plebeians, Roman, 253, 256–258; in medieval cities, 581
Pliny, the Elder, 373–374, 419; the Younger, 374
Plunket, Oliver, 805
Plutarch, 228, 371
Pluto, 155
Plymouth, 744, 797
Poitiers, battle of, 696
Poland, 458, 507, 508, 514, 540, 580, 602, 603, 610, 661, 663, 670, 675–676, 708–709, 798, 800, 804, 806, 835, 839, 840, 841, 843, 853–854, 859
Polemarch, 150
Polis, 148
Polo Brothers and Marco, 720–722
Poltava, battle of, 839
Polybius, 274
Polytheism, defined, 65
Pomerania, 803
Pompeii, 213 note, 329, 374
Pompey, 294–295, 305, 307, 313–317, 322
Pontifex Maximus, 421
Pontius Pilate, 411, 413
Pontus, 292, 293, 295, 300
Pope (Papacy), 427, 458, 466, 467, 488–489, 491, 495, 502–505, 506, 507, 508, 514, 553, 559, 562, 564–569, 575–578, 590–591, 600, 619, 647–658, 663, 666, 675, 678, 686–694, 720, 721, 748, 756–757, 769–770, 772, 776, 777, 784–787, 788, 790, 792, 798, 800, 807
Portugal, 446, 602, 603, 610, 614, 673, 674, 678, 708, 723–726, 728, 729, 731–732, 735, 736, 738, 743, 748–749, 762, 800, 806, 831
Poseidon, 130, 331
Potato, 111, 119
Pottery, 25–27, 34, 37, 52, 71, 73, 75, 98, 111, 124, 133, 149, 150, 153, 363, 365
Præmunire, statutes of, 690, 691
Prætorian Guard, 328, 337, 340, 341
Prætors, 254, 257, 313, 318
Pragmatic Sanction, 849
Prague, 507, 509; University of, 619, 784
Praxiteles, 212–213
Prefecture, 434
Prehistoric, 4
Presbyterian, 797, 804, 812, 813, 815

Priest, 426, 469
Prime Minister, 820–821, 834
Primogeniture, 528
Princeps, 326
Principate, 334–336
Printing, in China, 402–403, 777; European, 615, 777–781
Proconsuls, 313, 327
Procurators, 335
Proletariat, Roman, 307–309, 314, 318, 335
Proscriptions, 312, 324
Protestant. *See "Churches, Protestant"*
Provençal language and literature, 610, 611, 613
Provinces, Roman, 264–266, 275, 276, 281, 283, 291, 292, 293–296, 299, 300, 313, 319, 329, 335, 342–343, 348, 357–358; Church, 559
Prussia, 579, 580, 826, 835, 840–844, 849–850, 852, 853–854
Ptolemy, King of Egypt, 231–232, 285
Ptolemy, astronomer and geographer, 372–373, 775–776
Publicans, 294, 295, 305
Punic Wars, First, 273–275; Second, 277–281; Third, 283; results of, 283–285
Puritans, 812–817, 845, 854
Pyramids, Egyptian, 43–45; Mayan, 112–113; Toltec, 114
Pyrenees, treaty of, 828
Pyrrhus, 264
Pythagoras, 217
Pythian games, 206, 287 note

Quæstors, 254, 257, 313, 318
Quakers, 798, 804, 817 note, 854
Quebec, 744, 806, 851
Quintilian, 373, 756

Rabelais, 762
Racine, 763, 823 note
Raphael, 763, 770, 771, 786
Ratisbon, 557
Ravenna, 436, 489
Re, 65
Realism, 625
Reformation. *See "Churches, Protestant"*
Religion, Egyptian, 65–69; Sumerian, 54–55; Jewish, 80–81, 423, 475; Greek, 107, 129–130, 154–156, 206; Hellenistic, 238; Roman (Pagan), 251–252, 331, 407, 419–424, 432, 483, 486; Hindu, 107–108, 381, 388, 731, 733; Buddhist, 382–384, 386–387, 389, 399, 400, 723, 736, 738; Chinese, 390–393, 399; Persian (Zoroastrian), 163, 460, 481–482; Aztec, 116–117; early German, 442; Mongol, 456; early Slavic, 458; Japanese (Shinto), 738; Christian, 410–438, 460, 462–470, 481, 502–509, 624, 677–678, 718–720, 723, 726, 733, 736–739, 740, 743, 759, 783–808; Moslem (Islam), 470–483, 518–520, 677–678, 718, 731, 733
Religious Wars. *See "Wars, Modern Religious"*
Renaissance, 644 note, 754 note
Republic, 357. *See also "Athens," "Rome," "United States"*
Rhætia, 351
Rhegium, 180, 263
Rheims, 466, 638, 700
Rhetoric, 616
Rhine R., 297, 298–299, 329, 351, 353, 440, 441, 443, 457, 827–828, 831
Rhode Island, 854
Rhodes, 133, 230, 231, 286, 288
Ricci, Matteo, 736–737
Richard I, the Lion-Hearted, of England, 598, 653–654
Richard II, of England, 702
Richard III, of England, 703
Richelieu, Cardinal, 803, 821, 822, 828, 833
Rienzi, Cola di, 691
Rig Veda, 104–108, 120, 381
Right, petition of, 813
Rights, bill of, 818–819
Roads, Persian, 169; Roman, 267, 351, 352 (map)
Robert Guiscard, 512–513, 515
Roland, 490, 613, 614
Roman Empire, 334–376, 404–406; contact with India and China, 388, 398–399, 402; Christianized, 418–424, 429–435; invaded by Barbarians, 440–460, 477; wars with Persia, 460–461; invaded by Arabs, 477–483. *For later history, see "Byzantine Empire" and "Holy Roman Empire"*
Roman Law. *See "Law, Roman"*
Romance languages, 350, 494, 610, 637

Romances, 613
Romanesque, 435–436, 636, 637, 752
Romanov family, 836, 844
Rome, early, 248–252; patricians and plebs in, 252–259; unification of Italy by, 259–268; Punic Wars of, 270–285; expansion of, in Near East, 285–295; in Gaul, 295–299; results of expansion of, 299–301; as Republic, 303–331; as Empire, 303–331, 334–376, 404–406; contact of, with India and China, 388, 398–399, 402; Christianity in, 416, 425; Church of, 425–427, 431, 432, 437; attacked by Barbarians, 445–446, 447; as papal state, 488–489, 600, 689, 691, 764, 769–770, 780, 786. *See also "Church, Western (Catholic)," "Pope," and "Roman Empire"*
Rome, Bishop of, 426–427, 431, 432, 437. *See also "Pope"*
Roncesvalles, 490
Roses, Wars of the, 702–703
Rosetta stone, 41 note
Rouen, 700
Roundheads, 813–814
Roussillon, 830
Rubicon R., 316
Rudolph, Emperor, 578
Rumania, 350, 444, 610, 668, 670, 806. *See also "Dacia"*
Runnymede, 591
Rus, 510, 511, 512
Russia (Russian), 507–508, 511, 610, 661, 663, 675, 740, 745, 806, 835–840, 849–850, 853–854. *For early history, see "Scythia"*
Ryswick, treaty of, 831

Sabines, 260
Sacraments, 559, 624, 793, 807
Sacred Road. *See "Via Sacra"*
Saguntum, 277
Saint Paul's, London, 765
Saint Peter's, Rome, 491, 514, 763, 764, 770, 788
Saint Petersburg, 839
Saint Sophia, Constantinople, 370, 452, 500, 501, 502, 657, 671
Saladin, 653–654, 655, 660
Salamis, 151, 178–179
Salerno, University of, 619, 633
Salic Laws, 450, 466, 487
Salisbury, oath of, 590
Salonica, 416, 506, 514, 665
Salzburg, 557
Samarkand, 663
Samnites, 260, 263
Samos, 134, 181, 235
Sanhedrin, 411
Sanskrit, 105, 381, 388
Santo Domingo, 728
Sappho, 137–138
Saracens, 494, 514–515
Saragossa, 673
Saratoga, battle of, 857
Sardinia, 141, 270, 274, 275–276, 281, 283, 295, 299, 583
Sardis, 166, 172
Sargon, of Agade, 55–57
Sargon II, of Assyria, 87
Sassanid Empire, 355, 460, 478
Satrap (Satrapy), 168
Saul, 31
Savoy, 557, 831
Saxon Emperors, 572
Saxons, in England, 444, 447, 450–451, 454, 466, 468–470; in Germany, 491
Saxony, 557, 573, 612
Scandinavia, 106, 442, 494, 509–513, 610, 611, 615, 708. *See also "Denmark," "Norway," "Sweden"*
Schism, between Catholic and Orthodox Churches, 504; Great, 691–693, 785
Schliemann, 160
Scholasticism, 624–625, 627
Schools. *See "Education"*
Science, Greek, 216–217, 631; Hellenistic, 235–238, 772; Roman, 365, 372–374; in "Dark Age," 486; Byzantine, 501; Moslem, 516, 519–521, 631, 632, 634; medieval European, 616–617, 619, 629–634, 772–773; early modern, 679, 768, 773–777, 825
Scipio, 280, 281, 288, 289
Scotland, 470, 493, 505, 510, 596, 601, 602, 704, 708–709, 712, 797, 804, 806, 811, 812, 813, 815, 818, 819
Sculpture. *See "Art"*
Scutage, 527
Scythia (Scythians), 89, 92, 135, 151, 154, 168, 211. *For later history, see "Russia"*
Secularization, 808
Seleucia, 355

Seleucid dynasty, 229–230, 288–289, 354–355
Seleucus, 229, 285, 385
Selim I, Sultan, 668
Semites, 55–56, 79, 81, 83, 85, 86, 479. *See also "Arabia," "Jews," "Phœnicians," "Carthage"*
Semitic language and literature, 479
Senate, Roman, 252, 254–255, 257, 258, 284, 286, 287, 289, 290, 292, 303, 308, 310, 312, 313, 318, 319, 323, 324, 327, 334, 337, 339, 340, 341; Byzantine, 499
Seneca, 338, 373, 419
Sennacherib, 87, 88
Senusret III, 48
Separatists, 812
Serapis, 238
Serbia, 611. *See also "Yugoslavia"*
Serfdom, in Egypt, 47, 69; in Assyria, 88; in Sparta, 145; in Rome, 364; in medieval Europe, 535–536
Servetus, 798
Settlement, act of, 819
Seven Years' War, 849–852
Severus, 345
Sévigné, 763, 823 note
Seville, 516, 519
Sforza, family, 768
Shakespeare, 763
Shalmaneser III, 87
Sheriff, 590
Shih Huang-ti, 393–395
Shiites, 668
Shinto. *See "Religion, Japanese"*
Shogun (Shogunate), 409, 738
Siberia, 454, 740, 745, 835
Sicily, 82, 140, 141, 179–181, 207–208, 247, 264, 270, 272–273, 275, 281, 283, 295, 300, 306, 512–513, 557, 604, 650, 711. *See also "Two Sicilies"*
Sidon, 81, 82
Siena, 557
Sigismund, Emperor, 784–785
Silesia, 557, 661, 843, 849–850, 852, 853, 859
Silk trade, 398, 401
Silver Age of Latin, 373
Simeon, of Bulgaria, 497
Simonides, 156
Simony, 563, 564, 786
Sinai, 29, 48, 354 note
Singan Fu, 101
Sixtus IV, Pope, 769
Slave Wars, 307
Slavery, in Egypt, 47, 63; in Babylonia, 59; in Greece, 197–198, 211–212; in Rome, 285, 301, 304, 306–307, 361, 362, 375, 442–443, 458; general, 404; and Christianity, 420, 434–435; among Barbarians, 441; and medieval feudalism, 529; in America, 743–744; African, 745
Slavs, 106, 440, 441, 452, 458–460, 461, 470, 496, 506–509, 512, 579–580, 610, 615. *See also "Czechoslovakia," "Poland," "Russia," "Yugoslavia"*
Social War, Italian, 312
Socinus, 798
Socrates, 218–219, 238
Solomon, 80
Solon, 151–153
Sophists, 218
Sophocles, 192–193
Spain, copper in, 30; Greeks in, 141; Carthaginian rule in, 270, 271, 276–277, 280; as Roman province, 281, 283, 295, 296, 300, 319, 324, 329, 339, 341, 350, 363; Barbarians in, 446, 448, 452, 453, 459, 465, 466; Moslems in, 477–478, 481, 515, 516, 519–521, 546, 626, 645; Christians in, 521; cities in, 580; in Middle Age, 603–604; Crusades in, 672–673, 675, 678; in Morocco, 674; intolerance in, 674; Church in, 694, 800, 802, 806; under Habsburgs, 711, 735, 740, 741–744, 749, 828, 830, 831, 835, 847–848; under Ferdinand and Isabella, 706–708, 728, 748; Classical revival in, 757, 764, 766, 771; under Bourbons, 831, 835, 845, 848–849, 852, 858
Spanish language and literature, 610, 611, 614, 740, 761, 762
Spanish Succession, War of, 831, 848–849
Sparta, 130, 139, 142–147, 156, 157, 165, 171, 172, 174, 175, 177, 178, 179, 181, 182, 184, 186, 200–2, 206, 208–210, 223, 286, 290, 291, 445
Spartacus, 314
Spenser, Edmund, 763
Sphinx, 45, 72
Spice Islands, 721, 726, 739
Spires, 557
Stagira, 220
Star Chamber, 703, 706

Stephen, King of Hungary, 514, 602
Stoic philosophy (Stoicism), 239–240, 330, 331, 343–344, 361–362, 371, 377, 407, 431
Stone Ages, 3–34, 100, 109–111, 123–124, 244
Strabo, 330
Strasbourg, 447, 557, 639, 803, 830, 831; Oath of, 494
Strategos, 159, 186, 188
Stuart family, 602, 804, 811, 817, 820, 821, 834, 845
Sub-infeudation, 526
Sudras, 108
Sueves, 444, 446, 452
Suffetes, 271
Suger, 609
Suleiman, the Magnificent, Sultan, 669–670, 672, 675
Sulla, 293, 294, 312–313
Sumatra, 726, 739
Sumer (Sumerians), 29, 52–59, 89, 95, 99
Sunnites, 668
Susa, 56, 169, 227
Sussex, 451
Suttee, 733
Suzerain, 525
Swabia, 612
Sweden, 510, 513, 602, 708, 712, 828, 830, 835, 839, 842, 853
Swiss lake-dwellers, 24
Switzerland, 579, 794, 806
Sword, development of, 29–30
Sybaris, 136
Syracuse, 140, 180–181, 207–208, 215, 237, 261, 275 note, 279, 280, 281, 284
Syria, 56, 62, 63, 76, 77–83, 84, 87, 89, 90, 92, 166, 225, 226, 271, 285, 286, 288–289, 294, 300, 324, 329, 354, 355, 415, 461, 471, 476, 477, 479, 481, 482, 515, 517, 645, 646, 648, 651, 668, 677

Tacitus, 374, 419, 441, 756
Taj Mahal, 734
Tamerlane, 663, 733
Tang dynasty, 401–402
Tanit, 272
Taoism, 391
Tarentum, 263, 264, 284
Tarim River, 397, 398
Tarquins, 248, 261
Tarsus, 415
Tartars (Tatars), 660. *See also "Hsiung Nu," "Mongols"*
Tasso, 762
Taurus Mts., 56, 84
Taxes, Egyptian, 45, 48, 63; Cretan, 75; Persian, 170; Athenian, 199; Roman, 294, 295, 299, 319, 335, 347, 367, 524; English, 594, 812, 819; French, 600, 705, 824, 832; Turkish, 671; Papal, 687–688, 785–786. *See also "Tribute"*
Temples, Ancient, Egyptian, 44, 63–69; Sumerian, 54; Babylonian, 58; Solomon's, 80; Assyrian, 85, 89; Mayan, 111, 112–113; Toltec, 114; Inca, 118; Greek, 122, 124, 154, 193–194, 213; Roman, 248, 329, 367–369
Tenants on a Manor, 533, 534–540
Terremare, 244 note
Tetzel, 788
Teutoburg forest, 351
Teutones, 297
Teutonic Knights, 561, 580, 841
Teutonic language. *See "German language"*
Teutons. *See "Germans"*
Tewkesbury, battle of, 703
Thales, 136–137, 166
Thebes (in Egypt), 62, 63, 67, 68, 71, 167
Thebes (in Greece), 178, 196, 209–210, 222, 224
Themistocles, 176, 177, 178, 179, 183–185, 197, 199
Theodoric, 447–448
Theodosius, 432, 433, 440, 445, 465, 497
Theology, Moral, 552; 622–625
Thermopylæ, 177–178, 288, 445, 457
Theseus, 186
Thespis, 156
Thessaly, 147, 177, 200, 223
Thetes, 153, 189, 197
Thirty Years' War, 802–803, 828, 830, 841
Thomas Aquinas, 609, 626–627
Thomas à Becket, 591
Thomas à Kempis, 787
Thomas of Celano, 609
Thrace, 140, 168, 173, 200, 223, 457, 497, 665
Thucydides, 187, 190 note, 196
Thurii, 263, 264
Thuringians, 491, 506, 514

Thutmose I, 62
Thutmose III, 62, 63
Tiber River, 245, 248, 249
Tiberius, 334, 338, 389
Tibet, 101, 383, 396, 400, 402
Ticonderoga, 850
Tiglath-Pileser III, 87
Timur. *See "Tamerlane"*
Tiryns, 76, 122, 123, 126, 132
Tithes, 687–688
Titian, 770
Titus, 340
Tobacco, 119
Toledo, 519, 638, 673
Toleration, 805, 866–867; act of, 819
Toltecs, 114–115, 116, 120
Tories, 819, 834
Toul, 712
Toulouse, 446, 650
Tournaments, 532
Tours, 478, 488
Trade. *See "Barter," "Commerce"*
Trajan, 340–342, 353
Trasimeno, Battle of Lake, 278
Travel, 678
Trent, Council of, 798–799
Tribunes, 257, 284, 318, 326
Tribute, Egyptian, 63; Assyrian, 88; Persian, 169; Athenian, 183, 199; Carthaginian, 275; Roman, 275, 281, 294, 295, 299, 319, 357
Trier, 433, 557, 573
Tripoli, 477, 645, 669
Trireme, 176
Triumphs, Roman, 267–268
Triumvirate, First, 315–316; Second, 323–324
Trœzen, 200
Trojan War, 130–132
Troubadours, 613, 640
Troy, 130–132, 134
Troyes, treaty of, 698
Truce of God, 531–532
Tsar, 497
Tudor family, 703–704, 792–793, 794, 802, 804, 811
Tunis, 477, 516, 645, 669
Turanian, 455, 611, 646
Turkestan, 99, 397, 398, 444, 454, 471, 646, 661
Turkey. *See "Ottoman Empire"*
Turks, 517; Seljuk, 646–648, 650, 653, 660, 664; Ottoman, 664–672, 676, 807. *See also "Hsiung Nu," "Mongols," "Ottoman Empire," "Saracens," "Turkestan," "Turanian"*
Tuscany, 584, 614
Tutenkhamon, 67–68
Twelve Tables, 256
Two Sicilies, 557, 602, 604. *See also "Naples," "Sicily"*
Tyrants, 140–141, 153–157, 166, 171
Tyre, 81, 82, 270, 653
Tyrol, 557
Tyrtæus, 146

Ulfila, 464
Ulster, 794
Union, act of, 819
United States, 806, 854, 857–858, 860
Universities, medieval, 618–622, 633–634; in America, 743
Ur, 57
Urban II, Pope, 647, 648, 649
Urban VI, Pope, 691, 693
Usury, 552 note. *See also "Interest"*
Utrecht, 557; treaty of, 831, 848–849
Uxmal, 114

Vaisyas, 108
Valens, 445, 465
Vandals, 444, 446–447, 448, 452, 465
Van Dyck, 771
Varangians, 510
Varna, battle of, 666
Vasco da Gama, 722, 725–726
Vassal, 525
Vatican, 769, 770
Vauban, 827
Veda, 104–108, 120, 381
Veii, 261–262
Velasquez, 771
Venetia, 296. *See "Venice"*
Venezuela, 729
Venice, 540, 557, 581–583, 584, 654–660, 665, 666, 670, 675–676, 720, 721, 748, 755, 756; treaty of, 576
Venus de Milo, 231, 236
Vera Cruz, 742
Verazzano, 730
Verdun, 712; treaty of, 494, 571, 597
Vernaculars, 610, 612, 684, 759–760, 761–762
Versailles, 822–823, 824, 826, 838, 839
Vespasian, 338–340, 365, 373
Vespucci, Amerigo, 729
Vesta, 252
Vestal Virgins, 252, 432

Vesuvius, 374
Via Sacra, 267
Vienna, 670, 675; University of, 619
Vikings, 510, 511, 726
Villehardouin, 614
Villeins. *See "Serfdom, in medieval Europe"*
Vinland, 513, 726
Virgil, 329, 419, 608, 753, 758, 762
Virginia, 744
Visconti family, 585
Visigoths, 444, 445–446, 447, 450, 452, 457, 459, 464–465, 466, 477, 481, 487
Vladimir, of Kiev, 507, 512
Vogelweide, Walter von der, 613
Volsci, 262
Vulgate, 437, 608, 799

Wales, 596
Wall, Great, of China, 394, 395, 397
Wallace, William, 596
Walpole, 820–821
Warfare, ancient, 61–62, 164; in "Dark Age," 451–452; feudal, 487–488, 530–533, 553, 588–589, 628; firearms in, 685–686, 709
Wars, Egyptian, 62–63, 85; Hittite, 85; Assyrian, 85–87; Trojan, 130–132; Spartan, *see "Sparta"*; Persian, 163–181, 460–461; Peloponnesian, 200–202; Macedonian, 223–227; Latin League, 262; Samnite, 263; Pyrrhic, 264; Punic, 273–284; Mithradatic, 292–293; Gallic, 297–299; Social or Marsic, 312; Roman Civil, 346; Arab, 477–478; Hundred Years', 601, 689, 694–702, 709; Crusades, 645–679; of the Roses, 702–703; English Civil, 813–814; Thirty Years', 802–803, 828, 830, 841; of Palatinate, 830–831, 847–848; of Spanish Succession, 831, 848–849; Great Northern, 839; of Austrian Succession, 849; Seven Years', 849–852; American Revolutionary, 856–858; modern religious, 792, 796, 800–805, 821; modern dynastic, 709–712, 803–804, 828–831, 844–854; modern commercial and colonial, 747–749, 815, 844–854
Washington, 856–857, 858, 860
Weaving, 27, 111
Welf. *See "Guelph"*
Wessex, 451, 493, 511, 512
"West," defined, 715
West Indies, 806
Westminster Abbey, 595, 638
Westphalia, treaty of, 828
Wheel, invention of, 23
Whigs, 819, 834
Whitby, 470
William I, the Conqueror, of England, 512, 589–590, 594
William III, Orange, of England, 818–819, 820, 830, 847, 848
William of Rubruquis, 720
Willoughby, 730
Windsor, 591
Winfred, 505
Wittelsbach family, 579
Wittenberg, 788
Wolfe, 851
Women, position of, 59, 196–197, 406, 434, 455–456
Worms, 557, 565
Wren, Christopher, 765
Writing, 38–41, 53–54, 75, 82–83, 85, 88, 92, 95, 99, 100, 102, 104, 114, 124, 162–163, 390, 396, 400, 507, 519, 615, 777, 778, 781
Württemberg, 557
Wu-ti, 396–398
Wycliffe, 784, 790

Xenophon, 209 note, 758
Xerxes, 175, 177, 178, 179

Yangtse River, 101, 394, 396, 401
Yellow River, 99, 101
York, 468, 509, 638
York family, 700, 702–703
Yucatan, 114
Yugoslavia (Yugoslav), 496, 508–509, 611, 665, 670, 672, 676, 806

Zama, 281
Zeno, 239
Zeus, 129, 154, 179, 181, 206, 331
Zeus-Amon, 226
Zoroaster, 93, 460

1257
2368
3475
4186

113

State of Texas

Net Contract Price . . $1.65
Net Exchange Price . . 1.54

The price marked hereon is fixed by the State, and any deviation therefrom should be reported to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

..... Book No.

This book is the property of the State of Texas

..... School. ..... Co.

Issued to:		CONDITION OF BOOK Issued	Returned
Ryse Brown	, 193 3		
	, 193		
	, 193		
	, 193		
	, 193		